MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: I am just asking this question, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us discuss the internal security. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Siddiqui, please maintain the decorum of this House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

On Internal Security Scenario in the Country

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my gratitude to you for permitting us to raise the important issue for discussion on the internal security situation of the country. Sir, the UPA Government now has been in power for almost two-and-a-half years, and during its tenure in power, we, in the opposition, have several reasons to be disappointed with the performance of this Government. There are several fronts in which the Government has certainly not lived up to the popular expectations. We have had virtually, because of the ideological struggle between the Congress Party and the Left, a paralysis in the economic decision-making process of the country. We have seen in the last two-and-a-half years gross constitutional improprieties committed for partisan reasons in Jharkhand, in Goa, in Bihar; we have seen the dilution of the Prime Ministerial authority; we have seen the criminalisation of the Council of Ministers. We have seen pronouncements by members of the Council of Ministers, not in the direction of any higher standards of governance, but intended to harden caste and religious identities of this country. We have also seen the abrogation of an effort to pursue an independent foreign policy. Now, if we look at the overall performance of the UPA Government, these are the broad heads which have disappointed the whole country. But, if there is the largest single failure of this Government, it is certainly the management of the country's internal security. After two-and-a-half years of the UPA being in power, an average citizen is asking himself a question, not merely in areas which were traditionally infested with terrorism, but even in other parts of the country, that are we really sitting on a mine field, with the helpless Government, unable to have any action or response to the developing situation? The question, Sir, is, is India safe in the hands of the UPA? And, if we see the performance of this Government, we go back

disappointed with a great sense of insecurity that with instances of terrorism and disturbance to internal security increasing by the day, the Government is merely a helpless spectator. Every time any major incident of sabotage or attack or terrorist violence takes place, we see the leaders of this Government, the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Home Minister with the usual kind of cliches and templates that this is condemnable; the Government and the country will have zero-tolerance to terrorism. But, after these usual templates in terrorism, this Government then sits back and waits for the next attack to take place. This has been the history of the last two-and-a-half years. Today, we have the situation in Jammu and Kashmir, the situation in Assam again erupting, its fall out in various other parts of the country, and now you have a complete zone of violence emerging from the left wing extremism. If you look at the pronouncements of the Government and even the latest document that they have circulated, you will find that there is nothing which inspires real confidence among the people.

Sir, two-and-a-half years have seen internal security crumbling under this Government, if not collapsing. We are disappointed but not surprised. I went back to see what is often quoted—National Common Minimum Programme—as to what the UPA had to say on the subject; because, there, when you refer to the National Common Minimum Programme, they ask for a strict enforcement.

As I said, we are disappointed with the internal security situation but we are not surprised because the 24-page document virtually made no reference to the management of the country's internal security! The management of the internal security in this country is not a UPA priority! There is no mention of what the national strategy has to be to deal with terrorism, what the way forward has to be in order to ease the situation in Jammu and Kashmir, on how the Left Wing extremism has to be combated, what is the long-term strategy as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. The National Common Minimum Programme of the UPA did not spare much time or attention to all this. It is, therefore, understandable that the UPA's approach of inaction to this situation does not bring in turmoil within the UPA or its supporting parties in the Left. Because, as we said, we are disappointed but not surprised because this certainly not an area of the UPA priority. Are the UPA, the hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Home Minister, Sir, living in denial about what exactly the situation of the country is? We

do not think that they are really unaware of what is happening. When I say they are not unaware, all security and intelligence agencies have a close approach to the eyes and ears of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. And professional as they are, I have no doubt that our agencies have been keeping the highest functionaries of the Government informed as to what the ground-level situation today in the country is. We have a situation where the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and the entire Government pretend to be in denial of this. They are in denial of the existence of this problem because virtually it now appears that the crux of the problem is not that there is any lack of advisers in the intelligence or security agencies to professionally advise the Government on how the situation has to be tackled, but the real problem is the own approach of the UPA. If hard decisions are not to be taken, if terrorism and the deteriorating internal security situation is to be dealt with by kid gloves and the punch to be delivered must only have a velvet coating, then I am afraid, a Government of this time will never be able to effectively tackle the internal security of the country.

The point for the Government and the UPA is, Sir, that internal security has to be tackled on security considerations. But the approach of the UPA is: Can I make political capital out of it and in fighting terrorism, can I use that fight against terrorism also into an instrument of vote bank politics? So, security is not to be tackled on security considerations but security is to be tackled on vote bank considerations. And, if this is the approach of the UPA, then you will have the kind of shameful incidents which took place last week repeated by the day. Has it ever happened, Sir, in the 59 years of Indian history after Independence that an exasperated head of an intelligence agency chooses a public platform to deliver his views? These are all agencies, which very quietly advise the Government on the steps to be taken. But then even those heads of the intelligence agencies,—and I refer to the speech made by the Director of IB—realise that it is a case where the Government is not merely to be rapped on its knuckles but it is to be knocked on its head. Before the entire country, and television and media the Government is to be advised that all your existing traditional legal architectures for dealing with terrorism have failed and, therefore, think of a solution, which is commensurate with the problem that we are seeking to tackle. But then this would have no effect on a Government whose priority is not national security; whose priority is vote bank politics.

Within 48 hours came the response from the hon. Prime Minister that the Government has no such intention of enacting any tough law to deal with terrorism. It is a shameful incident, as I said, which has taken place.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): May I say something, Sir? The information, which is being given to this House, is incorrect. The hon. Member is quoting from the newspapers and speaking here. He has not read the speeches made either by the Prime Minister or the Director General. This kind of misleading will not help the country in controlling the security situation.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, I am extremely grateful to the hon. Home Minister for his intervention. In fact, the intervention just proves the point we are making. The intervention proves that not what some newspapers tried to interpret as, what camera showed, the exact phraseology from the mouth of the author and the orator that the existing legal architectures have not delivered, to deal with this situation we require a radical solution, we require a radical law, but then a Government, as I said, whose priority is not national security, whose priority merely is how to use a soft-on-terror approach as an instrument of vote bank politics, will not even understand this loud and clear message that came from the head of an intelligence agency. So, what is being interpreted in the intervention of the hon. Home Minister, I am sure he will elaborate it when he responds to this debate, is exactly the difficulty that we find with this Government. Sir, what is the magnitude of the problem? Sir, we had a situation 17 or 18 years ago where Pakistan realised very clearly that in conventional warfare it had not succeeded, and, therefore, it resorted to an alternative tactic. It saw the emergence of sabotage and terrorist attacks in India through cross border terrorism. Today you find that these are not attacks, which are merely confined to Jammu and Kashmir. You have a situation where the attacks and the networks are not merely limited to the State on which Pakistan has its eyes but today you have ISI modules, which have been expanding along the length and breadth of this country. The network exists if he sees some of the attacks, in Maharashtra, for instance, in different towns, the kind of recoveries which are being made and the kind of recoveries and explosives which are not being made by our security agencies and the State security agencies. How many recoveries have been made from Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Gujarat, Goa, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal? The network has expanded all across

the country, the targets, today, are clearly chosen. And, let us be very clear how the targets are chosen. The targets of principal terrorist attacks are chosen very carefully so as to destroy the economic, religious and social fabric of the Indian society. So, let us just take the major attacks which have taken place in the last one year or one-and-a-half years. Sir, 5th July, 2005, the chosen target was Ayodhya. They felt that it represented an important religious symbol as far as India was concerned. On the eye of Diwali last year — 29th October, 2005 — it was Delhi, the political capital of India. On the eve of Diwali, when security forces are on a high alert, they have proved that they can attack our political capital. Then, they have chosen Bangalore, the technological hub of India, on 28th December, 2005. Each of these targets is carefully chosen. Then, 7th March, 2006, Varanasi, attack against a religious and cultural hub of India. Next one is, Nagpur, an attempted attack on the headquarters of the RSS. Then, Sir, on 1st June, 2006, it is Mumbai. On 11th July, 2006, again, the effort was to attack the commercial hub of India. Thereafter, Malegaon — a town in which minority community is in majority. And, therefore, the target of attack was the minority itself so that some kind of upheaval could be created in the country itself. Each one of these major attacks, which are believed to be attacks inspired and planned across the border, are not in the traditional areas — Jammu and Kashmir — where terrorist attacks took place. The network and the art of violence are now spreading. They can almost choose targets at will. And, when they choose targets at will, they attack. And what has been our response? First, let us see the strength behind these attacks. Traditionally, we have said that it is done entirely from across the border. Most of these are even, today, planned across the border. Our police agencies have been trying to collect evidence. But, then, you find reports coming in that there is also an indigenisation of terror taking place. From what was initially a support only for logistics by local groups, you have to face an unfortunate reality and the reality being that these cross border attacks are also being supported at places by home-grown terrorists. Let us not forget that the centre of activities have also shifted. The fencing across the Western border has made it a little difficult to have infiltration. And, therefore, a large amount of infiltration is taking place from these open borders of Nepal and Bangladesh. And, from Nepal, it is of both kinds — not only the ISI but also the Left wing Extremists. In Bangladesh you have an open border. My party, for the last two to three decades has been speaking in terms of illegal immigration that is taking

place. Now, you find these attacks taking place by that route. It you have 20 million illegal migrant population, it is possible for these miscreants, these terrorists, to come and mix with the local population, since they look like Indians. So, detection becomes extremely difficult, Therefore, with this illegal migration taking place along Bangladesh border, it has almost become very easy for them to shift their hubs as the fencing has created a little difficulty in crossing the border as far as the Western borders are concerned. But, what is disappointing and a disillusionment for the country is not the fact that these attacks are taking place. There targets are clearly chosen. How much prior information do our intelligence agencies have with regard to these attacks. There are hundreds of these attacks and these ISI modules which our intelligence agencies in the past have cracked. But if you can have an attack like the one on 11th July, 2006 in Mumbai, where at seven different places, almost by a minute, explosions were made, dozens of people must have been involved in this operation of sabotage. They had picked up different stations, different trains, different people who must have transported them, who must have funded them, who must have placed the material in various local trains. And, despite the fact that the involvement is of such a large number of people, did we have advance intelligence information that these attacks are taking place at any of these places? The security response has been poor. In 1993, when Mumbai was attacked, within days, if I remember correctly, at that time, the whole case was cracked up. When our former Prime Minister, hon. Shri Rajiv Gandhi,was assassinated, within less than 24 hours our intelligence agencies, I remember, had drawn out the sketch and given to the newspapers that it was a lady, with a belt around her waist, who had done it. Our security experts created that incident which eventually proved to be true within less than 24 hours. When the Akshardham Temple was attacked, within hours, a whole night operation liquidated and the people who were virtually behind the logistical support were arrested. When this Parliament was attacked, the investigation response was that within 24 to 48 hours the response started coming out who were the possible and what was the manner in which the attack had been planned. But when the political executive of the day treats this as a non-priority item, it does inflict upon our intelligence agencies and our security, responses also. Today, if you were to categorically ask us who was behind the Malegon attack, who was behind Mumbai attack of 11th July, information are trickling in, but the response has been completely inadequate even months after

the incidents had taken place. What is the plight of those, as far as liquidations of some of these people are concerned, who face our security forces in these encounters? Are they increasing or decreasing? What is the response with regard to their prosecution and their convictions, and to the quality of evidence that has to be collected against them? There are several questions which will arise, where the Government by its inadequate response, by its negative response has lowered the national morale as far as the fight against terror is concerned. When I said that the CMP of the UPA did not give any details on how to fight terrorism, they can say that, probably, one of the only items that were there is the CMP was that "the anti-terrorism law, the POTA, will be repealed'. That was the only real response that the UPA had in this CMP in its fight against terrorism. You repealed the POTA. It was a law that was intended against terrorists. But you campaigned that it was not against terrorists, it was against a particular community. Thereafter, you repealed the POTA. Now, what was happened thereafter? It is even now not too late to realise your mistake. Obviously, the agencies must have advised the Government, and the Home Ministry said that there were several aspects in the POTA, such as, interception of communications, ban on organizations, confiscation of terrorist properties, defining terrorism. All these are areas which, from the POTA, we will lift bodily and put in another law, called the Unlawful Activities Act. So, a large number of these provisions were bodily lifted from the POTA and put in the Unlawful Activities Act. But, there were two important provisions. I make an important point here, and if the Government does not have the honesty to accept that even today, then, perhaps, even when it is already too late, the Government is not willing to see the reality. The two significant points in POTA were: one, it had special bail provisions, which made bail extremely difficult, if not impossible. Unless the court was satisfied that the accused is virtually innocent, bail was not to be granted. The second aspect was that confessions made to a police officer of high seniority were admissible as evidence. And when they were admissible as evidence, they could be treated as evidence. But after the judgement of the Superme Court in the TADA case, safeguards were introduced in the POTA that within 24 hours of the confession, the accused is to be produced before the Magistrate, and he can always deny to the Magistrate that he never made the confession. Then, the Magistrate can then direct the medical examination of the accused. These are the various safeguards in the law itself. Now, when POTA was enacted, Sir, these two special provisions along with

others, were not merely in POTA. Several State Governments said that POTA deals with terrorism, and we want the same power to deal with organised crime. So, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, they all asked for the same permission. The Governments successively started giving them permission. So, you had, the same law not for terrorists, but for organised mafias. For terrorists were must make effort to see that their civil liberties are safeguarded, but for organised mafia no such consideration is requried. This was an illogical approach of this Government. But let us see what happened thereafter. The Rajashtan Government and the Gujarat Government asked for the same law, verbatim. Their assemblies passed the same law as MCOCA, and the Karnataka law and Andhra law. For over two years this Government says, 'no such permission will be granted, we are still examining it.' These two States have not been permitted even to enact these laws against organised crimes. The Centre is sitting on it. Sir, ultimately, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. This entire argument is to try them under ordinary law. We all know that if the assassins of Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi had been tried under as ordinary law, without the benefits of those admissible confessions under TADA, what the judgement would have been? We now have a series of pronouncements from a Mumbai court in relation to the 1993 blasts. Let the Home Minister do an independent exercise in this Ministry that without the benefit of the evidence provisions in TADA, how many of these accused would have been convicted, and how many would have gone scot-free. Most of them would have gone scot-free. If under the Parliament attack case, and the Akshardham case, quick convictions were possible, this was one of the legal instruments for fighting terrorism. But, then, as I said, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Today, you have a Congress-NCP Government in Maharashtra. You don't have POTA because you thought POTA violates civil liberties. You had the incident of 11th July. You arrested some people. Why have you not tried them under the ordinary law? If your political argument was so correct, why were those arrested for 11th July, 2006 incident in Maharashtra, a State ruled by the Congress and the NCP, not tried under the ordinary law? They know that under the ordinary law these two advantages that the investigation has against terrorists will not be available. So, they have now formed a new device. We opposed POTA for political reasons, so we cannot bring POTA back. Ordinary law will be insufficient to deal with them. So, now, there is a localised law of POTA called MCOCA, which is not meant against terrorists, but which is meant to be used

against organised mafia. So, all the terrorists who have so far been arrested in the 11th July incident, try them under MCOCA, so that the benefit of a hard law is available to the prosecution. And the reasons why you have done this is very clear. You know that soft law will not work, and ordinary law will not work. But, yet, because the policy of the UPA is, "my vote bank should not be affected, I will, ostensibly, keep misleading the minorities of this country by repeatedly telling them that POTA was against you." Therefore, I repealed it and I am not bringing it back. But, then, how do I handle terrorism when I know that ordinary law cannot handle it? Well, in Maharashtra, we are doing it under MCOCA. But, what will you do in the other States, God forbid, if such an incident takes place? This, Sir, is the real dichotomy in the aproach as far as this Government is concerned, that as a Government it does not want to have all the powers on as to how to fight terrorism itself. Post-Kargil, Sir, there was an expert committee which was set up, which had given a detailed report on various issues. And, you had a very high-powered GoM of the Government of India which went into all those issues. The Leader of the Opposition was an important Member of the GoM and on the advice of the GoM you had various kinds of institutions within the Government which had been set up, where intelligence coordination, processing of that intelligence, thinking in terms of steps as to how to deal with each emerging situation, each one of them was planned and Governmental systems within agencies were created. You had the Intelligence Coordination Group, you had the technological committee, because of the technologies used by these militants, you had the National Technology Research Organisation, and you had joined Task Forces on processing this intelligence. We are disappointed, Sir, that though not abolished, most of these agencies have really become non-functional. They have really become defunct. Good work was done by that Committee which went into all the entire issue post-Kargil and gave a detailed report on the management of various issues including internal security, and, thereafter, a high-powered Group of Ministers spent months and months together in recommendations and in creating institutions which were required for this country. You have a Government to respond where each one of these institutions created has become defunct! What is the political approach of the Government? Let us look at the political approach as far as each of the issues is concerned. You wanted a healing touch in Jammu and Kashmir. The PDP-Congress coalition was formed, then, as a result of a democratic process, a popular Government has come in; power

must go to the people and let us have a healing touch as far as the State is concerned. Today, you have within the State uncertainty because the two coalition partners are virtually at a cold war with each other, if not a real war. The Central Government appears to be virtually clueless on how to deal with the situation, except for making formal announcements from time to time; and announcements of the kind that let us have a round-table conference. You had a first round-table conference, which gave you some security inputs, and then, you had a second round-table conference. Even groups like Hurriyat did not have command. I don't expect Hurriyat and the Government to agree, but, at least, they could discuss. When the NDA was in power, they came and discussed and said, "we have disagreed", but we at least have a confidence that this Government is honestly dealing with us. The Hurriyat said, "no useful purpose is going to be served in even discussing with you." The round-table conference, I am not so sure, was called after necessary security inputs from the intelligence agencies or the different security agencies. Had proper homework and the build up to the round-table conference been done? It remained a square-table conference where the corners needed a lot more bending before the conference could be held, but nothing of the kind was done. And you finally had only some friendly groups coming and discussing, giving suggestions, and going away, and nothing came out of it. And, then, because you had to show that there was some input coming out of the round-table conference, you made an announcement of setting up different groups. The people, who have taken training in Pakistan and have come back, how is their rehabilitation possible? Well, we would have been very happy if, at least, one group had an explicit item on its agenda that 'you have almost had an ethnic cleansing for the last fifteen years, the *Kashmiri Pandits* who have been driven away from the Valley, their problem will also be discussed.' But that was not a priority item. Let us look at the honesty of this Government. I have read in the newspapers today that you are going to give seven lakh rupees in Gujarat to some people who were affected. Are you willing to follow the same yardstick with regard to those three-and-a-half lakh to four lakh people who, as a result of the ethnic cleansing, have been moved out of the Valley? Well, that doesn't suit your politics. And, therefore, when you had the round-table conference, you started announcing groups, and, let me tell you, Sir, we are now moving towards one of the more dangerous areas. One of the groups is, 'to deal with the Centre-State constitutional relationship.' The group, which is to deal with

the Centre-State constitutional relationship, is not going to resolve the problem. Before you go and give gestures or statements of this kind, let us effectively argue today, what part of the Kashmir problem is attributable to the fact that within the Valley, the Assembly has inadequate powers. Compared to the rest of the country which is more peaceful, if there is one State where the Assembly and the Government have disproportionately higher powers in the distribution of power in a federal politics, it is Jammu and Kashmir. The problem is terrorism, the problem is cross-border terrorism; the problem is economic. Instead of addressing that problem, you set up a group, how to reconsider and review the constitutional relationship between Jammu and Kashmir and India. And, even before the group has started functioning, you already have a problem at hand. Your alliance partner is saying, 'self-rule' and our stand in that group is going to be 'self-rule.' The other important political party in the State, the National Conference, is saying, 'pre-1953 status'. Sir, I repeal the question that I had asked myself, is any part of the Kashmir problem attributable to the fact that the Kashmir Government or the Kashmir Assembly has lesser, inadequate powers? Instead of addressing that problem in a frontal manner, you want to give some contrary political signals, and, therefore, just as we are repenting over our mistake of the 1950s, you now want to create a second round of mistakes that Indian generations over the next hundred, two hundred years would start repenting and say, whatever is the present constitutional relationship, let us further loosen it. This is your approach as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time would be required by you? Why I am asking this is because the time allotted to you is over.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, another ten minutes. I am sorry, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. I have to remind you because the time allotted to you is over.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: You come out with *ad hoc* kind of solutions. The Pakistani Foreign Minister is on a personal visit to India. The same hon. gentleman, some two months ago, on Pakistani television gave an interview saying, 'The Government of India has given us "a non-paper", not a formal document, but a "non-paper". And, a 'non-paper' really speaks in terms of the pre-1953 situation. Now, whether this has been given by some bad channel diplomacy or not, we do not know. But are these the kind of

solutions that you are trying to find from this? And, coupled with this, Sir, kindly see when we are on Kashmir, the entire drift in the country's policy which has taken place. The obvious effort of Pakistan over the past few decades was that the centrality of the foreign policy issue should be Kashmir. Pakistan always said 'it is a disputed territory and, therefore, this should be the centrality of the issue.' President Musharraf, when the came for the Agra Summit, said, 'this is the core issue.' What happened during the six years of the NDA Government? Globally and bilaterally, the centrality was acquired by cross-border terrorism. Indian diplomacy was at its peak when it said that globally, if there was one issue of internationalisation between India and Pakistan, it was cross-border terrorism. Pakistan wanted to internationalise Kashmir while we wanted to internationalise cross-border terrorism; and the world started listening to us during those six years. And today, when at Havana, and on the way back, our distinguished Prime Minister says that Pakistan is also a victim of terror and that all terrorist groups in Pakistan are, in fact, autonomous of the Pakistani Government, then, this is exactly the kind of argument that Pakistan has been using all these years — 'if somebody uses or misuses my soil it is without my consent; we are also honestly trying'. President Musharraff says, 'there have been attempts on my life also'. Where was the occasion for us to abandon our decleared foreign policy of internationalising cross-border terrorism, placing voluminous evidence of cross-border terrorism? Instead of saying that today, instead of cross-border terrorism, the internationalised issue is again Kashmir, because on terrorism now, the difference between the Government of India's policy and Pakistan's declared policy has almost been obliterated.

Sir, the issue is not only Kashmir. The second difficult area is Assam, which is emerging once again. Since the attacks and blasts which took place in the Fancy Bazaar of Guwahati and the repeated attacks thereafter, what kind of serious inputs are we having when we say that we will call a People's Consultation Group which would start mediating, that the People's Consultation Group would have talks and in those talks not even the lowest rung of ULFA would participate? In the talks with the People's Consultation Group, through the group with the Government of India, not even the lowest rung of ULFA leadership has participated. We suddenly say there would be a ceasefire and, in the face of that ceasefire we declare there, we find violence erupting again and Assam going back to a situation from which we decided to rescue it back.

Sir, let us look at the approach of the Government. When we speak in terms of internal security, my entire emphasis in the debate is not merely on one case of Afzal Guru; it is only an illustration as to what the attitude of the Government is going to be. Somebody tries to attack this most vital institution of Indian democracy, the Indian Parliament; he conspires in that and after he conspires in that, the courts of law uphold his conviction —three courts, one after the other, find there is adequate evidence. He tries to virtually annihilate the entire political leadership of India. This attack, if it had succeeded, if our security guards had not laid down their lives, if these 12 doors had not been closed, even if one door had remained open, a very large number of us present here today may not have been there, with the kinds of weapons those people had. We don't have armed security inside Parliament ...(*Interruptions*)... Is that why you are rewarding the gentleman concerned?

Sir, today, in such a situation, can there be any scope for a debate whether in these kinds of cases the power of clemency has to be exercised? There have been cases which the Government may go on considering indefinitely but there are cases where the Governments in the past disposed of such cases within hours. In the case of the assassins of Gen. Vaidya the clemency application was disposed of within hours. ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, if these are the issues, the issue is not ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Rajiv Gandhi's case was kept with the Government continuously for five years.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, let this be a lesson that there has to be some time-bound system within the Government, within the highest constitutional functionaries of the Government, to dispose this off. Otherwise, it is reflective of the kind of national intent that we have. The issues are not merely of this kind. When I speak of Kashmir or the North-East, what is emerging now as an even more serious problem? We normally speak of North-East or Kashmir. Where do we stand as far as Left-Wing extremism in India is concerned? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): We are not escortiang terrorists. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, as far as the acts of ...(*Interruptions*)... Those who are accused of killing your leader, you inducted them in the Cabinet.

3.00 P.M.

...(*Interruptions*)... If you want a discussion at that level, you will get a response back ...(*Interruptions*)... One of the accused in the killing of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi is a part of your Council of Ministers. ...(*Interruptions*)... If you want a debate at this level, you will get it back. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: We are prepared for discussion. ...(*Interruptions*)... If it is a challenge, we are ready for discussion. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When your turn comes, you can answer. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please sit down ...(*Interruptions*)... Please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please don't interrupt. ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Jaitley, please conclude. ...(*Interruptions*)... आप बैठिए, जेटली जी जो कहेंगे, वही रिकॉर्ड में जाएगा। ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI ARUN JAITELY: Sir, it is a very important subject. I, therefore, do not want to bring it down to the level of these kinds of attacks for comments. Let us now just consider where do we stand as far as Left-Wing extremism or Maoism, that we call it, is concerned. Punjab was a troubled State; Jammu and Kashmir is a troubled State and some areas of North-East are troubled. Together between them, they occupy about 12 per cent of the geographical area of this country. The population that they involve is almost 5 per cent of this country, maybe a little less than that. I am mentioning this to just give you an idea of the spread of Left-Wing extremism that has taken place. Today, right from the border of Assam till down deep south, you have 40 per cent of India's geographical area, 35 per cent of population, whose habitable areas are directly or indirectly affected by Naxalism. You have thick forests in these areas, occupying 19 per cent of our total forest area or mineral resources, the economic life-line. The width or size of this area is two-and-a-half times of the size of entire Bangladesh. These are the areas in which parallel Governments are running or their primacies are being established. Sir, if we read some of the Maoist literature, it tells us the effort where they claim to have succeeded, and they use the phrase "Creation of a Compact Revolutionary Zone." It is called CRZ. I don't know whethere your SEZs may see the light of day or not, but the CRZ is already there. These Compact Revolutionary Zones from the border of Nepal cover Jharkhand, Bihar, parts of Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Chhattisgarh, parts of Karnataka and a lot of Andhra Pradesh. These are all areas which are parts of the Compact Revolutionary Zones. Their literature

now tells us that their second strategy is that rural areas around urban centres are to be consolidated and, therefore, the encirclement of these cities have to take place. When it passes through the lifeline of this country, from West to East and North to South, and the centre, the economic lifeline of this country can be stopped. And, experts tell us that in the last three years, the human resource that they have been able to add to their strength, their incremental strength itself has been 30 per cent more. And, if they increase by another 30 per cent, their ability to paralyse these compact revolutionary zones, the encircled cities and the economic lifeline of this country is going to be much higher. They have had trials, and just see the kind of trials — there are hon. Membes from each of the States— you had Koraput in Orissa, East Champaran in Madhuban. I happened to be, at that time, in Patna when this incident took place during the Bihar elections. About 300 people came, captured the entire city, captured and police stations, captured the treasury, attacked the house of RJD Member of Parliament, Shri Sitaram Singh, looted the banks and then went away. Sir, one police station was captured in Naxalbadi and a movement had begun and we thought that through the 70s, we had been able to finish off the movement. Today, in East Champaran in Madhuban, you had this case. And, then, you had Jehanabad. The entire jail administration was taken over. The prisoners were got released. In Giridih in Jharkhand, the entire take-over took place.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaitley, you should conclude now. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have allowed him for whatever time he asked for because of important subject.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I will try to confine myself. Sir, the most dangerous aspect of this movement has been one that geographically and in terms of population, it encompasses a very large area. These are compact areas. There is a high level of militarisation of this movement which has taken place. The quality of weapons they have, undoubtedly, can face the best of security forces. In areas where they have been able to establish control, where they levy taxes, where they run parallel Governments, usual security agencies and Government agencies are reluctant to interfere. They interwine with the people, and therefore, they are able to socially organise a large number of people. Sir, a disturbing aspect has been that when they attempt to kill, when they attempt to destroy commercial establishments, or attempt a take-over, you have a large number of their sympathisers who act as the overground face of this underground movement. They do it in the name of

human rights; they do it in various other names and start rationalising this kind of violence. How is the Government going to deal with all this? Sir, Afzal Guru or POTA or the Prime Minister's statements in Havana, the Prime Minster's response by wanting to loosen the Constitutional relationship between India and Kashmir pursuant to the Round Table are only indicators of the facts as to which way the mind of the Government is working. The problem is immense and the Government seems to be working diametrically in the opposite direction. When I mentioned that the illegal migration problem today has creted 20 million of illegal migrants, equal to the size of smaller countries in the world, where terrorists can come and intertwine and mix with the population and retaliate, what is the response of this Government? The Supreme Court says that the IMDT Act was really enacted for the purpose of legitimatising infiltration. It created a complicated procedure by which infiltration could be legitimatised and, therefore, it is unconstitutional. What is declared unconstitutional, this Government immediately proclaims a Foreigners Control Order, and what is struck down in the name of IMDT, it brings back in the name of Foreigners Control Order. The response is 'no'. They may be illegal, they may be a security threat but they are useful voters. This apears to be the response of the Government. Let us forget the IMDT for a moment. Sir, I would like to ask today, and, I am sure that the hon. Home Minister will respond, what happened to the multipurpose national identity cards scheme. It had reached an advanced stage. It has many useful purposes to perform. We still don't know what has happened to it. Sir, the biggest mistake that a Government can do is what this Government is doing. And, instead of addressing the problem of terrorism, you deflect the solution.

And, in global strategy against terrorism, this is popularly referred to as the root-cause theory. Well, if somebody says that there was terrorism on 9/11 in New York, the cause of it was such and such action that the American took. When we say 'cross-border terrorism', President Musharraf says, "Well, the root cause is in Kashmir." And, therefore, every person who wants to condone terrorism, instead of addressing it and taking it head on, will deflect to the root-cause theory and the approach of this Government, which I see in this yellow book -- thank God, it is not a red book -- is that you deflect the solution to a root-cause problem. Well, we must try and make development in this region; we must try and find these kinds of solution rather than find a direct solution on how to deal with

terrorism. You may require social solutions but, at the same time, the security situations really cannot be ignored. (*Time-bell*)

Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me the time to speak. I may be allowed to just wind up. I come back to the question, which I had initially asked. Is this country safe in the hands of the UPA Government? From the approach of the Government, it is very clear that we are not. Our boundaries are not safe, our borders are not safe, and, our people are not safe. It is a Government, which consciously/wants to live in denial about the existence of the terrorism and the security threats. This Government, Sir, is soft on terror, it is soft on infiltrations, it is soft on a strong anti-terrorist law, it is soft on procuring convictions, it is soft on infiltrations of terrorists, it is soft even in the matter of hanging convicted terrorists. It is clueless on Jammu and Kashmir. On ULFA, the latest round shows that it is like Alice in wonderland. It does not know how to deal with the situation. Some social groups, authors, well meaning people come in and negotiate and no solutions are there. And, Sir, as far as the threat from Maoists is concerned, before it is too late, the Government needs to wake up. The Government has still not realised the intensity of the knock that the Director (IB) gave on its head when publicly, in the presence of the Prime Minister, when he said, we need to get rid of the old architecture and need a new architecture. And, Sir, if this Government does not find to respond to it, and, it thinks that it is useful 'votes' by being soft on terror, let me just remind this Government, there are many, many patriotic people in this country, many times more patriotic than what this Government feels, before the Government realises that it is too late, the people will be ready to throw it out lock, stock and barrel unless it pulls its socks up and starts acting on this problem of terrorism. Thank you.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset, let me thank the Opposition and the learned Member of the Opposition for giving a useful opportunity to discuss a very important subject of internal security. Sir, the subject of internal security, is by definition, always important, and, if constructive facts, constructive inputs can be given, it is good for the nation. I certainly do not want to play politics on this important thing, and, I hope and trust that no one else does this. This is far too important a subject, and, therefore, the opportunity to discuss it is cold logic, cold facts with cold statistics is an important aspect But, Sir, let me at the outset, ask myself a question. Internal

security, unfortunately, happens to be a much-misunderstood word, a much-misunderstood phrase, indeed, a much-abused phrase. And, it is important before we go ahead to define the exact contours and scope of this phrase, becuase a lot of answers and a lot of questions will fall into place, if we understand what internal security is. Internal security, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, is not law and order, as we all know. As we know, the Constitution of India, in the First Item of the Second List says law and order. And, what is that? That is exclusively given to the States to regulate. Equally, internal security is not simple external security or national security. That is for the Government of India under the Defence Ministry, and that is what the First List of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution tells us. It is not even simple public order. The apex court has said that the phrase 'public order', 'law and order', 'national security' may be ever expanding concentric circles. But, they are not really internal security. Therefore, internal security is a very peculiar species. It is really a hybrid animal. It's an animal which interestingly, and I checked this up the other day and I was surprised to find, does not find a mention in our Constitution anywhere. The closest is 'internal disturbance' in article 355. Internal security is not used anywhere. It does not find a mention in List One; it does not find a mention in List Two; it does not find a mention in List Three. Therefore, once you separate and keep in mind that it is the State Governments which deal with law and order, under exclusive Legislative and Executive competence, once, it is the Central Government which deals with defence preparedness under exclusive List One competence, we come to the real core of internal security, whch is frequently a much-abused word. What does it then boil down to and should we really be discussing as the core theme of internal security, so important for our nation? Certainly, yes, interception, infiltration, various aspects of terrorism, but, not merely law and order or even crime. I will come to the details in a moment. But, we have to keep this in mind when we throw concepts like organised crime, rape, murder, which are very serious, which any society must combat, but not necessarily combat under the rubric of the internal security theme. Why? Because, the Central Government, is what we are discussing today. It is the Home Ministry that we are discussing today. The Home Ministry cannot go and prevent murders and loot in States for you, howsoever desirable it is. If we do that, you will accuse us of affecting ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI (Uttar Pradesh): You can do that in Delhi ...(*Interruptions*)..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak, please. ...(*Interruptions*)...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Please, have some patience. ...(*Interruptions*).. I will be happy to deal with the occasions ...(*Interruptions*).. The important thing is ...(*Interruptions*)..

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: वहां एक हुआ था, यहां हजार होते हैं and the Home Ministry ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a serious discussion. Please don't interrupt ...(*Interruptions*).. No, it is not good ...(*Interruptions*)..

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: I am only adding to what he is saying. I am supporting him ...(*Interruptions*)..

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't support him. He does not need your support right now.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: The real point I wish to make, Sir, is that frequently a discussion on internal security tends to degenerate into a mere discussion on law and order, or, even external defence preparedness. That is what it is not and should not be, because we then go away from the core of internal security. But, Sir, let us turn to some of the issues the learned Member has raised. Unfortunately, the hon. Member, in raising a very important theme of internal security, has not dealt with any concrete fact, not a single statistic, not a single concrete fact. He has touched on issues and themes at the level of broad generality, and let me show you how. The first issue he dealt with, I will come to POTA in a minute, was Jammu and Kashmir. Yes, we have had a healing touch policy. We proclaim healing touch very openly and in writing. And, what has been the result of that? The result of that has been rather interesting, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. And, that is why I would have liked if my friend would have drawn this House's attention to some concrete facts. We are not here to trade charges. We do not consider Jammu and Kashmir to be a political issue. We do not consider even the debate on internal security to be a political issue. But we cannot run awan from facts. Just take a few of them. Some of you have this published book. The figures are here in the published book circulated by the hon. Minister.

Between 2004 and 2005, the number of civilians killed in Jammu and Kashmir has come down by roughly 25-33 per cent. It does not mean that 557 killings are good or tolerable. But it is certainly a significant decrease, a noticeable and appreciable decrease. Take the number of terrorists killed. There is a decrease.

In 2006, the figures show a 33 per cent decline. Now, there is much to be done. But to generally castigate and give an impression of a fear psychosis that Jammu and Kashmir is falling apart is not correct. And why is that, Sir? There are very interesting reasons for it. You must keep in mind that Jammu and Kashmir has had a reconstruction plan of the degree of Rs. 24,000 crore. Now, Rs. 24,000 crore is not given as some kind of a donation or some kind of a *bheekh* or a charity; it is given because this Government believes in the solid reconstruction of Jammu and Kashmir. It is not something you will see tomorrow. I will not be able to count Rs. 24,000 crore for you. But you will see it in power plants, in irrigation dams, in roads, in bridges, and you will see it with a gestation lag. It is a gestation lag of 4-5 years which takes time for this plan to come. Who gave this plan? Who sincerely felt that Jammu and Kashmir requires this reconstruction plan? It is this Government, the UPA Government. And that is something which has had a direct impact, and the figures show that.

With Jammu and Kashmir, there are regional imbalances. In Ladakh, there is general peace. Jammu region is better than other areas, although there are some incidents. It is the valley which is the cause for concern. In fact, the graphs are more graphic because they show steep decline; and more than a decline, they show a trend of decline, a continuing trend of decline.

Take the figure of 2004 on incidents, on civilians killed, and on terrorists killed. The figures are all for you to see. There is no reference to figures, unfortunately, in my hon. friend's speech. We did not play politics on Jammu and Kashmir. When the previous Government was in power, I think flip-flops had become the policy of the day. How many flip-flops have Jammu and Kashmir seen in the previous Government's regime? Certainly, they are nobody to tell us about how to go about matters in Jammu and Kashmir in a consistent manner. What have we done? The Prime Minister has set up five focussed Working Groups. They are Working Groups dealing with the various measures. Economic development is one, good governance is

the other, Centre-State relations is third, and so on and so forth. Deliberations are in progress.

There are, very interestingly, more than 5000 tenements for migrants in Jammu. Most of the construction is complete with about Rs. 200 crore. These are figures which are boring. These are not sensationalism. There are not slogans and shibboleths; but they are very important hard facts. And when a House as august as this discussed it, we have to keep to the hard facts. We have two-bedroom flats for migrants with about Rs. 25 crore expenditure nearing completions. We have another Rs. 159 rehabilitation programme for six thousand plus families in Akhnoor. Can I ask, very respectfully and humbly, my friend who talked of migrants and of Jammu region? Was any of this done by them? Well, you can always have crocodile tears but concrete work. What concrete work was done? The answer has to be an eloquent silence. It is these hard facts and not our 'softness on terror' which matters. Your word 'soft' will not make us 'soft'. The hard facts make your allegation of softness wrong.

Let us come to my friend's and his party's favourite theme--POTA. POTA is a very interesting case case study on the complete fallacy and the complete political nature of the argument raised by the Opposition. POTA has two aspects, both in law and in actual practice in politics and society. POTA has human rights aspect, an arrest aspect, a physical aspect, a torture aspect, or a denial of human rights aspect. Equally, it had another aspect--an aspect of interception, forfeiture, infiltration, funding, proclamation and pursuing the funds of terrorism. According to me--and I may be wrong, but I would like to be corrected--the preventive aspect of terrorism is really dependent on these aspects, on infiltration, on interception, on catching the funds at source and tracing them right through till the end down the chain, through trans-border transfers. All of these preventive aspects of terrorism have been reincarnated by this Government in the Unlawful Activities Act. All of them, they have been improved, they have been strengthened, but they are all there. Not one of them has been deleted despite the big propaganda of the Opposition that POTA has been repealed, POTA has been repealed, soft on terror etc. Well, this is the preventive aspect of terror. Yes, we were open about it. We said so in this august House, in the joint session under Rule 184; we said so in our manifesto; we said so in our Common Minimum Programme that the other aspect of POTA--the human rights aspect, the arrest aspect and the

physical abuse aspect—is something we do not believe will decrease terrorism. And, therefore, we proclaimed to the people before we went to the electorate that we will repeal it; but, we will repeal those aspects, the abusive aspects of POTA. And the people took that manifesto of ours, they took that declaration of ours and they voted us back to power. Now, that is the distinction. You had the same POTA and you had TADA as well. We had TADA. TADA told us that the success rate of TADA is abysmally low. Nobody knows the real facts. Somebody says, it is two per cent; somebody says, it is four per cent. Let us take four per cent. Is it a success rate which will justify the use of TADA against the farmers of Gujarat which is what has happened there in statistical terms? So, we repealed TADA and we repealed POTA after going to the people on an issue on which we were not hypocritical, but were upfront; and the people accepted that this is correct. That is obviously proved. After all, your POTA did not prevent...

श्री रूद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): सर, पोटा के बाद ...(व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: देखिए, जब आपकी तरफ से बोल रहे थे तो क्या उनको इंटरप्ट किया? .. **(व्यवधान) नहीं, पाणि जी, आप बैठिए।...(व्यवधान) कुछ नहीं जाएगा।...(व्यवधान) रिकार्ड पर नहीं जाएगा।...(व्यवधान)**

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: You had POTA. But, unfortunately, POTA coexisted with an attack on Parliament; POTA coexisted with attacks on Raghunath Mandir and Akshardham. POTA coexisted with so many incidents. So, POTA, by itself, is not a magical wand. I would like to create a law tomorrow here saying, by this law, I hereby abolish terrorism. If it was that easy, we would all be in happier times. This is misleading the public. This is playing politics. This is not going to the depth of the matter. The depth of the matter is that terrorism is controlled by preventive measures, by intelligence and information which we are doing and we shall strengthen ourselves more in doing. The depth of the matter is that you need a climate where abuses do not create more extremists and more terrorists. Yes, we don't subscribe to the root-cause theory. We do not think that terrorism is negotiable, we do not think that terrorism is justifiable for any cause, but equally we do not think that alienation of large sections of people will solve terrorism. We will deal with terrorism with a very firm hand, but equally we will have an inclusive definition of growth where we do not create further

terrorists and further enemies. That is the approach of this Government and it's an approach on which this Government is proud and the allies are proud; and of which people have taken note and voted us back to power. That is so far as POTA goes.

The third aspect my friend touched upon was the other favourite theme, Afzal, which has seen mention here earlier. I would like this august House to consider these startling facts. I ask myself a question and I ask this august House; Doesn't Afzal, like hundreds of people before him for the last 60 years in free independent India, have a right to make an appeal under article 72? Now, I am one of those who believe and we have said so and the Congress Party believes this that to seek compulsory acquittal or pardon is as bad as seeking compulsory hanging. Aristotle once said, Sir, virtue is the golden mean between two vices, each of which is an extreme. The extreme is always a vice. The golden mean lies in between. If you ask for a compulsory hanging, are you not repealing article 72 for one man? Afzal Guru shall not have article 72. You and I shall have it only to apply. But, equally, if you say 'instantaneously pardon him now', we do not stand for that. Who has said that? Have we ever said so? More importantly, Sir, I said I would not like to play politics on a sensitive issue like that, but, I am compelled to point out that there is hypocrisy in the Opposition's stand; there is double facedness; there are double standards. Let me remind you, Sir, and let me also remind this august House, that a few years ago, in a crime like dropping weapons by a foreign national, from an aircraft, over the territory of India, a man was convicted. That is a crime which is equal to treason, if done by a citizen of India. Treason is a crime which is no less important than the Parliament attack or the former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's assassination. He was convicted. His name was Peter Bleach. He was kept in incarceration. He was not pardoned, Sir. He was not commuted. He was not reprieved. He was physically left free and escorted out of the country! And who did that, Sir? That was done by the previous Government which is today shedding crocodile tears and raising a hue and cry. And till today, I would challenge anybody there to give us one good reason why this was done. Is there any accountability to the nation? No reason, Not even a reason why Peter Bleach, how Peter Bleach, when Bleach and how come Peter Bleach was released, was given. That is the duplicity; that is where the argument breaks down. That is why politics comes into it.

The third aspect of Afzal Guru, Sir, is I have here with me—and some of you may have been it--a chart showing, illustrating that hypocrisy in graphic terms. This is a chart of 22 cases. I will minus three or four. About 18-19 cases, here, have a time period of an average of five years for exercise of the mercy power. And those four years-four years have expired during the term of the previous Government. The dates are here. They range from 1990 to 2004, from 1990 to 2003 or from 2002 to 2005. My learned friends there, my hon. friends there, know very well that it is a process, it is a constitutional process; it takes time. It should not take five years, as it took you. And item 5 of my chart, Sir, is very interesting. Item 5 of my chart, reads: File No. 14/1/99JC. Name of condemned prisoner : Murugan, Santhan and Arivu, Tamil Nadu. Brief details of case: Rajiv Gandhi's assassination case. Date of death awarded by courts: January 1998, and Supreme Court, May 1999. Date of rejection by the Governor: October 1999. Date of Receipt from State Government: May 2000. Date of submission to the President : 2005. For five long years, this Government which wants instantaneous non-consideration of Afzal's application has kept an assassination attempt convict pending. This is, I am sure, my hon. Member would not say that the former Prime Minister's assassination is any less important than an attack on Parliament. Both are reprehensible. And there are 19 other cases, Sir, which range from four to five years. Now, the point of the matter is that we do not stand for compulsory acquittal; we do not stand for compulsory mercy; we do not stand for compulsory reprieve. But equally, we do not stand for not giving him a right for the application to be considered. And you know -- most of you are eminent people who know this already — that it is a long process. The application has to come either from the family or from the accused or the convict. It has to go to the Home Ministry; the Home Ministry has to refer it to the prosecuting State. In this case, it would be Delhi. The prosecuting State, Delhi, would have to refer it to the Police of Delhi. The Police of Delhi would give a report; it will come back to the NCT of Delhi; it will then come back to the Home Ministry. The President my raise two questions. It will come back to the Home Ministry. Now, this may take six months or nine months. But, today, my friends there are taking out rallies, disrupting Parliament and raising questions that instantaneously here and now, as I speak, you must put him on the nearest pole and hang him and not consider his application. Sir, we are proud that we are not a tinpot dictatorship; we are proud that we are a functioning vibrant democracy. In a vibrant

democracy, we give an equal chance, an equal bite at the apple, both to you, to me and to Afzal. ...*(Interruptions)*... That does not mean...*(Interruptions)*... That does not mean...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री सुरेन्द्र मोतीलाल पटेल (गुजरात) : सर, ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : आप खामोश रहिए।

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: That does not mean that Afzal should be let off or that he should be hanged. Let the President decide. In fact, I must say with utmost respectability that we are not supposed to discuss the conduct of the President here in this august House; we are not supposed to comment on the President's acts or omissions, alleged or otherwise. But, apparently, the entire Rule Book, the Constitution, the precedents, conventions and practices, good behaviour are forgotten by my hon. friends on the other side. Lastly, Sir, on Afzal Guru, the Supreme Court, two weeks ago, has reiterated its power of judicial review again on mercy power to be exercised. There is a judgement now from Andhra Pradesh and there are other judgements earlier which say that even if the mercy is exercised good or bad, the court has the last word to review it. So, why is the Opposition worried? If they find that there is arbitrariness in the exercise of the power, the apex court is still there because the apex court has asserted judicial review over such power. But then, to build an argument that he should be hanged immediately without further ado does not behove either of a responsible Opposition, which I am sure they are, or of a vibrant functioning democracy, which I am convinced we are.

Sir, the third aspect is that my friend talked about the North-East and he only mentioned Guwahati and sadly again without figures and facts. Let me draw your attention back to those boring facts; but they are somewhat inconvenient facts. The North-East has had, I would say, almost as a good improvement just as Jammu and Kashmir. The figures of Jammu and Kashmir, I have just given you. The North-East figures are a little than Jammu and Kashmir, but still significant not only in improvement but also the trend is in one direction. Now, in the North-East there is one problem. There is a regional disparity in terms of the internal security situation, In fact, as the figure shows, Mizoram, by God's grade, is, by and large, peaceful. Arunachal Pradesh is, by and large, peaceful. Tripura has earlier, during the previous Government, witnessed some problem, but in the recent

past has seen a dramatic improvement of almost 30-40 per cent. We have the figures here and you have the figures in that chart. Unfortunately, the total gets a little dimmed and undermined by the fact that Manipur has experienced some bad events and statistically larger events. Nagaland also contributes, but for a curious reason or for a peculiar reason. In Nagaland, the two man group, or rather the main group of extremists or terrorists, whatever you may call them, has been into two sub-groups. They are know, I am told, as "M" and "K". Unfortunately, the "M" and "K" are killing each other which is contributing to the explosions and to the statistics. Assam has had rather good figure except in the recent past. In Assam, there is another very curious trend. The number of incidents is high, but the number of deaths is low. I asked myself this question and we discussed it, and I found a very interesting conclusion that, perhaps, the ULFA did not want to create unpopularity by creating explosions which caused deaths. They want to create explosions but to make a point, and not to cause deaths because that causes unpopularity. This is the reality. We are certainly very concened about it. I am not suggesting that the decline from "X" to 33 per cent means that the balance is a tolerable figure. Please don't misunderstand me. That is not my intention at all. Even one death is serious. But these are matters to be dealt with in a serious way. We have, like Kashmir, a Rs. 24,000 crores reconstruction plan. We have Rs. 20,000 crores for the North-East. The figure is Rs. 20,000 crores. It is provided by this Government which believes not a talk, not in use of adjectives like "soft" and "hard" but in hard bold facts and hard bold steps.

Sir, the other aspect is Naxalite. Yes, really speaking, internal security in its definition and concept, as I started off in the beginning, boils down to, as I said, Jammu and Kashmir, North-East and Naxalites. The hon. Home Minister, I am sure, will deal with it in great deal later. But it is very interesting that when we go into the details, we tend to over-react and we tend to paint ourselves and this country into a black picture, thereby generating a kind of fear and alarm because you and I, and all responsbile citizens, when we hear that 40 per cent of the country is in the hands of the Naxalites and 35 per cent of the population is in the hands of the Naxalites, are rightly alarmed -- I mean I would expect you to be and I would be--because this is a democratic country. But these figures can be misleading. There are very simple reasons for it. There are large parts of India, in Jharkhand, in Orissa, in Bihar and down south, going further down

from Orissa, where there may be a village or two in a district, where Naxalite (Maoist) activity is there. The whole district in our method of counting is designated as a Naxalite area. If you ask a question as to how many villages or village posts are affected by this scourge, the figure will be considerably less. But what happens is that you make a red corridor to our own detriment and to our own fear psychosis from Nepal to Tamil Nadu because you tend to generalise and aggregate districts as a whole, whereas the problem--it is, of course, a serious problem--is happily more localised. The figures are very interesting. Sir, the figures are very interesting. It is seen in that book at page 40 that Andhra Pradesh has experienced a dramatic decrease in Naxal activities; there is a dramatic decline of 40-50 per cent for which we don't have to be self-congratulatory, but we should receive some encomiums. Sir, in respect of States like Orissa, Chhattisgarh, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Jharkhand, the main Naxal areas, overall, there has been a huge decline. But the decline has been less than it should be becuase of one State which stands out, where the Naxal activity is, unfortunateiy, very, very high, and the average becomes had because of one State. That State — I don't want to play politics, but I am duty-bound to give you hard, cold facts — is Chhattisgarh. This State has experienced a dramatic increase in Naxal activities. Yes; what does the Central Government do? The Central Government cannot go and police the State. It is not a Police Authority or a law and order authority, that falls under List II. To Chhattisgarh, the Home Ministry offers helicopters; they offer armoured vehicles, where if you fire from big guns, the vehicle does not break. I was interested to learn that they even offer reimbursement of monies. If you run out of defence or BSF or other Home Ministerial helicopters; they say, "You hire private ones, but we will reimburse you." But Chhattisgarh has still a very high figure. I am not blaming Chhattisgarh, but I am pointing out a fact. I think the hon. Member should have looked into his own backyard before making an allegation about the presence of Naxalities in various States. Just to say that it is 35-40 per cent is not true; in villages, it is far fewer. And, in terms of the internal breakup of the Naxal-affected States, Chhattisgarh, by leaps and bounds, is ahead. It is a matter of concern to us, but it should be a matter of greater concern to my friend and his party.

Sir, I would conclude shortly by pointing out that the Central Government is always very keen to do whatever it can to hold out a helping hand. That

is why I started with the constitutional scheme. We can hold out a helping hand only if the States ask us to. As you know, you and I would be the first ones to shout if we pushed ourselves in there because only article 356 can permit us to do so. But wherever we were asked, we have given 37 battalions, that is, 37,000 persons of paramilitary nature, to these States. It is a mini army. I think the States have a mini army with these 37,000 persons. They ask for it, and we give it. We have given armoured vehicles, helicopters, aeroplanes and large volumes of money. There are various schemes; if you are a Naxalite and you surrender, then, a bank account is opened with some money in it; there is immediately employment, and there is a withdrawal of cases. But you are pursued and monitored for six months to see that you don't fall back into his bad ways. So, if you are genuine, it works. It is a carrot-and-stick policy. We are not hesitant to have the carrot as much as the stick because it is both which work together.

Sir, there are issues about other targets like the Railways. These are jurisdictional issues, and I have no doubt that the hon. Home Ministry and the Railway Ministry will be able to work this out. The Railways is a very peculiar thing; the Railways pass through at fast speed through several States. The people, who take care of Railway property, are the Railway police. The people who take care of the place or passengers could only be the State. But the State keeps changing every 10 or 15 minutes. So you need to work out a system how the Railways are protected in a greater measure. I found from the website that the BJP's National Executive meeting of 7th to 9th September said some of the things which the hon. Member also has mentioned here. In particular, it tended to say that the UPA did nothing and said nothing about the national security in its Common Minimum Programme or in its manifesto except saying that they would repeal the POTA. That is totally incorrect. That is painting a wrong picture. I read to you our Common Minimum Programme. There are two parts; Page 15 says, "New initiatives will be launched to bring investments in areas like power, tourism, handicraft and sériculture." Then, it says at page 16, which the 8th September, 2006 meeting of the National Executive meeting of the BJP forgot to mention and thereby it misinforms its own members. At page 16, it is said, "The UPA Government is determined to tackle terrorism, militancy and insurgency in the North-East as a matter of urgent national priority." That is a declaration. It is also there in our manifesto. "All the North-Eastern States will be given special assistance

to upgrade and expand infrastructure in this regard. The North-Eastern Council will be strengthened to give adequate professional support...". "The territorial integrity of existing States will be maintained." We are not unconcerned about important issues like this. But we do not like to play politics.

Sir, may I end by quoting to you some words of a stirring speech given by Kennedy when he was installed as President? I think those words are important for countries concerned about their internal security and about security in general. Of course, it is the same speech where he also said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country". In the same speech elsewhere, he said, "Every nation knows whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend and oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty". And the Government of India is committed to that. The UPA is committed to that. He also said, and that is our approach and that is our philosophy, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich", and that approach also animates our overall approach. But civility is not a sign of weakness. Sincerity is always subject to proof. When we talk to Pakistan, we do not talk with our guard down; we do not negotiate out of fear. But, Sir, we do not fear to negotiate because it is important not to negotiate out of fear, but it is equally important not to fear to negotiate.

Ultimately, Sir, on such matters, there has to be across-the-board support in the Houses of Parliament, in the message to the nation, that we are all together. These are matters where the unity of Parliament is more symbolic and more important as a message than even the content of what we speak here. Let me assure you, as I started by saying that we thank you for this opportunity to give you facts and figures, we thank you in particular because, through you, we are able to convey to the nation what we have done, what we are doing and what we are committed to doing. And the facts and figures, in conclusion, I may say, which are available in that book, are striking. They tell you the core, scope and focus of the concept of internal security, not mere law and order, not murders, not policing, not defence preparedness. It tells you also how much we have done and how happily in this country there has been an improvement on concrete facts and figures with, of course, focussed areas requiring more attention.

I thank you, Sir, very much.

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: उपसभापति महोदय, मैं सबसे पहले तो मुझसे पहले जो दोनों स्पीकर बोले

हैं, उन्हें बधाई देना चाहता हूं और इस देश की आम जनता और सिक्युरिटी फोर्सेस को बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह से हमने पार्टी पॉलिटिक्स से ऊपर उठकर और आपस के इख़्तलाफात से ऊपर उठकर, पिछले बीस साल से आतंकवाद का मुकाबला किया है, मैं समझता हूं कि दुनिया में उसकी दूसरी मिसाल नहीं मिलती है। यह मसला ऐसा है कि इस पर यदि हम ब्लेम गेम खेलेंगे तो हम देश के साथ अन्याय करेंगे और आतंकवादियों की सहायता करेंगे। इसलिए मेरी कोशिश यह होगी कि ईमानदारी से जो बातें मैं महसूस करता हूं कि इन्टरनल सिक्युरिटी को ज्यादा पुख्ता बनाने के लिए जरूरी है कि मैं उनको कहूं। अगर इसमें कहीं किसी के माज़ी के कामों की कोई आलोचना होती है तो उसका मकसद मेरा किसी को ब्लेम करना नहीं है, बल्कि मेरा मकसद यह है कि उससे हम सबक सीखकर आगे के लिए आतंकवाद का मुकाबला दृढ़ता के साथ, एकता के साथ मुत्तहिद होकर कर सकें। सर, सबसे पहले तो मैं एक बात यह कहना चाहूंगा कि जब हम सिक्युरिटी की बात करते हैं तो सिर्फ बार्डर की, जमीन की, पहाड़ों की बात नहीं करते हैं। जब हम सिक्युरिटी की बात करते हैं तो हमारे सामने देश की सिक्युरिटी के सवाल पर, फूड सिक्युरिटी एक बहुत अहम मसला है, एनर्जी सिक्युरिटी एक बहुत अहम मसला है, सोशल सिक्युरिटी एक बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण मसला है, कम्युनल सिक्युरिटी एक बहुत बड़ा मसला है, एक इंडिज्युअल की सिक्युरिटी, यह भी एक बहुत बड़ा मसला है क्योंकि सब पास में जुड़े हुए हैं। किसी राष्ट्र की सिक्युरिटी अपने आप में वैक्यूम में नहीं होती है, आइसोलेशन में नहीं होती है। राष्ट्र की सिक्युरिटी उसकी फूड सिक्युरिटी, उसकी एनर्जी सिक्युरिटी सबके साथ जुड़ी होती है। यहां पर समय नहीं है, वरना इन चीजों पर इस सदन के अंदर बहस होनी चाहिए कि हमारी जो एनर्जी और सोशल सिक्युरिटी है, उसका क्या प्रभाव पड़ रहा है, यह जो हमारी फूड सिक्युरिटी है, इसका हमारे नक्सलवाद के बढ़ने में क्या प्रभाव पड़ रहा है, दंगे होने में क्या प्रभाव पड़ रहा है, क्योंकि नक्सलवाद कोई हमारी मिट्टी में से जन्म नहीं लेता है, नक्सलवाद ने हमारी परम्परा और हमारे धर्म से जन्म नहीं लिया है।

उपसभापति महोदय, नक्सलवाद ने अगर जन्म लिया है, तो हमारे इन सारे समाजी सवालों से जुड़ी हुई जो गलतियां हैं, हमने पिछले 60 सालों में या उससे पहले जो गलतियां की हैं, इसमें उसका भी दोष है, उसके बारे में भी हमको बात करनी होगी क्योंकि जब तक एक national consensus नहीं होगा, एक national understanding नहीं होगी कि हमें किस तरह से आतंकवाद का मुकाबला करना है, तब तक यह नहीं होगा क्योंकि आतंकवाद का मुकाबला सिर्फ सिक्योरिटी फोर्सेज से, उनको सिर्फ हथियार देने से, सिर्फ हेलीकॉप्टर देने से, सिर्फ arms देने से नहीं होगा; आतंकवाद का मुकाबला लोगों को भरोसा देने से, उनका भरोसा जीतने से, उनको एक feeling of belonging देने से होगा। यह जो alienation है, चाहे वह alienation माइनॉरिटीज में है, चाहे वह रीजनल ग्रुप्स में है, चाहे हमारे कश्मीरी पंडितों में है, यह sense of alienation किसी भी देश के लिए सबसे बड़ी खतरनाक चीज होती है। इस sense of alienation को दूर करने के लिए political leadership को सामने आना होगा और मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि

हमारी political leadership कहीं न कहीं फेल हुई है। पिछले 20-25 सालों में हमारी political leadership फेल हुई है, इस सेंस में नहीं कि हम आतंकवाद से लड़ नहीं पाए, यह इस सेंस में फेल हुई है कि हम पार्टी पोलिटिक्स से ऊपर उठकर, अपने छोटे-छोटे हितों से ऊपर उठकर राष्ट्रीय हित में एक पालिसी पर consensus नहीं बना पाए और जब तक इस तरह के issues पर consensus नहीं होता चाहे वह foreign policy हो, चाहे वह internal security हो, तब तक क्या होता है कि जब हमारे बीच टकराव होता है, तो उसका फायदा हमारे विरोधी उठाते हैं - चाहे वे अंदरूनी हों, चाहे बाहरी हों। इसके लिए हमें एक पालिसी बनानी होगी, जिसमें हमें blame game से निकलना होगा।

उपसभापति महोदय, अभी तक जो वोट बैंक की पोलिटिक्स होती रही है, वह हर तरफ से हुई है, इसका हमें इलाज ढूंढना होगा। फारूक साहब, मैं डिटेल में नहीं जाना चाहता, चाहे वह अफज़ल गुरू का मामला है, चाहे वह गुजरात के दंगों का मामला है, चाहे वह 1993 के मुंबई में जो दंगे हुए, उनका मामला है, हम तरह-तरह से वोट बैंक पालिटिक्स करते रहे हैं, यह देश के हित में नहीं है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूं कि इसमें पोलिटिकल लीडरशिप का कहीं न कहीं फेल्योर है। इससे हमें ऊपर उठना होगा और हमें सेंसिटिव होना पड़ेगा और माइनॉरिटीज़ की जो grievances हैं — ethical, religious and social इनके बारे में हमें ज्यादा सेंसिटिव होना पड़ेगा, यह मेरा आपसे कहना है।

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे एक बात और कहनी होगी कि हमारी जो intelligence agencies हैं, उनका भी कहीं फेल्योर है और हम इसको कहते हुए डरते और घबराते हैं और जो कहता है, उसको कह दिया जाता है कि शायद यह देश के हित में बात नहीं कर रहा है, लेकिन हमें समझना पड़ेगा कि चूंकि इन intelligenceagencies को कोई लेखा-जोखा नहीं होता, यहां RAW के ऊपर कोई बहस नहीं होती, यहां IB के ऊपर या दूसरी एजेंसीज़ के ऊपर कोई बहस नहीं होती है, इन एजेंसीज़ के लोग भाग-भागकर अमरीका चले जाते हैं, किस तरह से देश के हितों को कुरबान करते हैं, किस तरह से बाहर के देशों को यहां की जानकारी बेचते हैं, किस तरह से अंदर गलत रिपोर्टिंग करते हैं, कैसे राजनीतिक दलों के इशारे पर वे काम करते हैं। जब intelligence agencies किसी राजनीतिक दल के इशारे पर काम करेंगी — चाहे ये हों, चाहे ये हों, चाहे हम हों, कोई भी हो, तो फिर intelligence agencies एक political tool बन जाती हैं, अगर वे political tool बन जाती हैं तो उनकी आज़ादी, उनकी ईमानदारी खत्म हो जाती है और ये एजेंसियां इस तरह से काम करती हैं जिससे देश का नुकसान होता है और यह नुकसान हम काफी समय से देख रहे हैं।

उपसभापति महोदय, इस संदर्भ में मैं एक बात बहुत ईमानदारी के साथ कहना चाहता हूं और मैं चाहूंगा कि मेरे साथी इस पर भड़के नहीं, मैं किसी को भड़काने के लिए नहीं कह रहा हूं, यह

अखबारों में, मैगजींस में, सब जगह रिपोर्ट आई है और सच्चर कमीशन ने भी कहा कि intelligence agencies में माइनॉरिटीज़ को, खास तौर पर मुसलमानों को बाहर रखा गया है और आज intelligence agencies दिक्कत महसूस कर रही हैं क्योंकि उर्दू में इतना कुछ आता है, हमें पाकिस्तान की खबर रखनी है, हमें अफगानिस्तान की खबर रखनी है, हमें दूसरे इलाकों की खबर रखनी है, लेकिन वहां पर ऐसे लोग मौजूद नहीं हैं, जो इस पर बहुत ईमानदारी के साथ सोच सकें। पिछले 60 सालों में उनको आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता बाहर कर दिया गया है। आज केवल चंद लोग हैं, वरना उसमें मुसलमान लोग नहीं हैं। नतीजा यह होता है कि intelligence agencies में अगर यह अहसास हो जाए कि कोई एक कम्युनिटी भरोसे के लायक नहीं है, तो आपने शुरूआत में ही उनके दिल में बीज डाल दिया और उस बीज से ज़हर उगेगा और वे ईमानदारी से उस कम्युनिटी को नहीं देख पाएंगे। सर, यह वह कम्युनिटी है, जिसे फौज में जगह मिली हो या न मिली हो, लेकिन शहीद होने वालों में वे सबसे आगे थे। मैं हवलदार अब्दुल हमीद की बात नहीं करता, मैं पैटन टैंकों की बात नहीं करता, मैं आज की कारगिल के जंग की बात करता हूं। कारगिल के जंग में हमारे 500 से ऊपर जवान शहीद हुए, लेकिन मुझे जहां इस बात पर फख्र है कि हमारे जवान ने देश की सुरक्षा की, वहीं इस बात पर भी फख्र है कि मैं हिन्दुस्तानी मुसलमान हूं और यहां से हमारे 48 नौजवान थे, जिन्होंने शहादत हासिल की यानी 8.5 प्रतिशत। फौज के अन्दर ये 2 प्रतिशत नहीं हैं, जबकि मरने वालों में 8.5 प्रतिशत हैं। जब-जब आपने मौका दिया है, जब-जब इस देश ने मौका दिया है, हमने साबित किया है कि देश की सुरक्षा के सवाल पर हम किसी से कम नहीं हैं, हम सबसे आगे हैं। इसलिए मैं कहूंगा कि इस कमी को होम मिनिस्टर साहब दूर करें, जो इंटेलीजेंस एजेंसियों में एक bias है और लोगों में alienation है। वह bias देश के हित के खिलाफ काम करता है। उससे आतंकवादियों को पकड़ने में फायदा नहीं मिलता। अभी मुम्बई में जो तज़किरा हुआ, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि मुम्बई हो या कहीं और, कई बार ऐसा होता है कि पुलिस के ऊपर दबाव होता है कि जल्दी-से-जल्दी केस solve करो और पुलिस दबाव में कुछ लोगों को पकड़ कर, जिनके खास नाम होते हैं, खास चेहरे होते हैं, जो खास किस्म की टोपियां पहनते हैं, उन्हें मीडिया के सामने आगे कर देते हैं। बाद में सबूत मिले या न मिले, उसे बाद में देखा जाता है। इसलिए मकोका की जरूरत पड़ती है, इसलिए टाडा की जरूरत पड़ती है और इसलिए टाडा, पोटा, मकोका, सब fail हो जाते हैं। उनके conviction का rate 4 परसेंट भी नहीं होता, इसलिए कि अक्सर बेगुनाहों को पकड़ा जाता है। उसमें गड़बड़ क्या है? जब बेगुनाह पकड़े जाते हैं, तो असली गुनहगार निकल जाते हैं। एक झूठ बोला जाता है, उस झूठ को छिपाने के लिए 10 झूठ बोलने पड़ते हैं और जब 10 झूठ बोले जाते हैं, तो जो आतंकवादी हैं, जो देश के दुश्मन हैं, जो बाहर से आने वाले हैं, वे तो निकल जाते हैं, हम कुछ लोगों को बहाना बना कर अपने सीने पर तमगा लगा लेते हैं। मैं यह कोई अजीब बात नहीं कह रहा हूं। हमारी फौज के केसेज़ आए हैं कि जहां पर हमने लोगों को पकड़ कर मारा है, फिल्में बनाई हैं और यह दिखाया है कि हमने बाहर से आने वाले आतंकवादियों को, जेहादियों को मार दिया। अपने लोगों को टोमैटो सॉस डाल-डाल कर दिखाया है, फारूक साहब को मालूम

है और इसके ऊपर काफी कुछ मीडिया में आया है। हम पैसे देकर झूठे सरेंडर दिखाते हैं, आतंकवादी आकर सरेंडर करते हैं, वे कोई आतंकवादी नहीं होते, वे गांव के लड़के होते हैं। हमारी फौज मेडल लगवा लेती है। सर, पुलिस भी ऐसा करती है। ऐसा नहीं है कि पुलिस ऐसा काम नहीं कर रही है। इसलिए हमें इस चीज़ के ऊपर उठना पड़ेगा। आज मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि मुम्बई में जो कुछ हो रहा है या मालेगांव में जो कुछ हुआ है, हमने प्रधानमंत्री जी से भी बात की थीं, हम सारे एमपीज़ जमा होकर होम मिनिस्टर साहब के पास भी गए, हम महाराष्ट्र के चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब के पास भी गए लेकिन हमको इंसाफ नहीं मिला। यह जो alienation है, यह बहुत खतरनाक है। हमारे दुश्मन ताक में बैठे हैं। वे इस alienation का पूरा फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं। हम उन्हें इसका फायदा नहीं उठाने देंगे, मुझे इस बात का विश्वास है। लेकिन हमारा काम मुश्किल हो जाएगा। हमारा काम मुश्किल बना रही है बाज़ एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव ग्रुप्स, बाज़ इंटेलीजेंस के ग्रुप। अपने छोटे-छोटे फायदे के लिए हम इस काम को मुश्किल बना रहे हैं।

सर, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अयोध्या का तज़किरा हुआ कि वहां पर आतंकवादी हमला हुआ, हमारे वाराणसी में आतंकवादी हमला हुआ, अभी मुम्बई में ट्रेन के ऊपर आतंवादी हमला हुआ। हमने पाकिस्तान से कहा कि आपका हाथ है, हमारे पास सबूत हैं। अभी जब पिछले दिनों पाकिस्तान से होम सेक्रेटरी आए और बातचीत हुई, तो हमने उन्हें क्या पेश किया? मुम्बई का नहीं, बल्कि उनके सामने वाराणसी का केस किया, क्योंकि हमने उसे solve कर लिया था। हमने अयोध्या का केस पूरा का पूरा चन्द हफ्ते के solve अन्दर करके आतंकवादियों को पकड़ कर, उन्हें मिटा कर सब चीजें देश के सामने रख दीं। हमें इसके लिए राजनीति से ऊपर उठ कर उत्तर प्रदेश की एसटीएफ को बधाई देनी होगी। अगर आप इस पर राजनीति करेंगे, सिर्फ इसलिए कि यह एसटीएफ उत्तर प्रदेश की है, क्योंकि उत्तर प्रदेश में आपकी और आपकी सरकार नहीं है, तो यह गलत होगा, पुलिस के साथ अन्याय होगा, इस देश के उन लोगों के साथ अन्याय होगा, जो ईमानदारी से काम कर रहे हैं। अगर ऐसा ही था, तो मुम्बई के जो धमाके हुए थे, आप उसका पूरा केस पाकिस्तान के सामने रखते, उन्हें कटघरे में खड़ा कर देते, लेकिन आपने क्या रखा—वाराणसी का केस, क्योंकि उत्तर प्रदेश की पुलिस ने वाराणसी का केस शानदार तरीके से solve किया था और उसके लिए हमें उन्हें बधाई देनी चाहिए। लेकिन होता यह है कि हम राजनीति करते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूं कि मैं राजनीति नहीं करता हूं, राजनीति हम सब करते हैं। सर, यही एक बड़ी कमजोरी है, जिससे हमें बाहर निकलना होगा और हमें इसे देखना होगा कि हम इस तरह की राजनीति न करें। अभी नक्सलाइट मूवमेंट के बारे में कहा गया कि नक्सल मूवमेंट हमारी इंटरनल सेक्युरिटी के लिए बहुत बड़ा खतरा है। यह पिछले दिनों बढ़ा है यह मैंने नहीं कहा, होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है और दूसरे लोगों ने कहा है कि नक्सल मूवमेंट नेपाल से लेकर साउथ तक एक रेड कॉरीडोर के रूप में बना है।

श्री शिवराज वी॰ पाटिल: आप जिस तरह से बहुत सारी बाते मेरे मुंह में डाल रहे हैं, यह गलत है। आप मुझे मिले ही नहीं हैं। मैंने कॉरीडोर की बात भी नहीं की है। आप और भी बहुत सारी बातें बता रहे हैं और मैं यहां बैठा हुआ हूं।

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: पिछले साल अखबार में आप का बयान नक्सलाइट्स के बारे में आया था।

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have never said that, ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी: हो सकता है, मैं गलत कह रहा हूं, लेकिन यह सच्चाई हूं कि एक नक्सल कॉरीडोर बना है। होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने नहीं कहा होगा। अगर नहीं कहा तो बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि क्यों नहीं कहा? यह कॉरीडोर है, पूरा देश कह रहा है, पूरा मीडिया कह रहा और हम कह दें कि नहीं ऐसा कुछ नहीं है, इस तरह से तो आप सच्चाई को नकार रहे हैं। आप सच्चाई को मत नकारिए। यह नक्सल मूवमेंट पाकिस्तान की देन नहीं है, यह बांग्लादेश की देन नहीं है, यह हमारी अपनी देन है। यह हमारी कमजोरियां हैं। हम ने जिस तरह से ट्राइबल्स को ट्रीट किया है, जिस तरह से हम आज ट्राइबल्स को ट्रीट कर रहे हैं, जंगल में रहने वालों को ट्रीट कर रहे हैं, आदिवासियों की ट्रीट कर रहे हैं, alienation को बढ़ा रहे हैं, यह उस का नतीजा है। महोदय, मैं सरकार को बधाई देता हूं कि उन्होंने कम-से-कम इस फैक्ट को माना है कि नक्सल मूवमेंट से डील करने का सिर्फ लॉ-एंड-ऑर्डर का तरीका नहीं है बल्कि हम सोशियो-इकॉनोमिक तरीके से चलकर इस नक्सल मूवमेंट से लड़ पाएंगे। इसके सोशियो-इकॉनोमिक डाइमेंशंस हैं जिन्हें समझकर सरकार ने कुछ पॉलिसीज बनायी हैं और उसमें आप के साथ पूरा देश रहेगा।

महोदय, मैं बात को ज्यादा आगे नहीं बढ़ाना चाहता, लेकिन मैं एक बात यह कहना चाहता हूं कि तमाम चीजों के बाजजूद एक इफैक्टिव नेशनल सेक्युरिटी मैनेजमेंट मुझे नजर नहीं आया। हो सकता है कि मेरी मालूमात कम हो, लेकिन एक कॉर्डीनेटेड सेक्युरिटी मैनेजमेंट सिस्टम होना चाहिए ताकि वह इंटरनल और एक्स्टर्नल सेक्युरिटी के बीच की डायनॉमिक्स के ऊपर पूरी नजर रख सके। अभी क्या होता है कि कहीं पर यह स्टेट सब्जैक्ट है, लेकिन इंटरनल सेक्युरिटी का मामला है, कहीं पर केन्द्र का सब्जैक्ट है, लेकिन इंटरनल सेक्युरिटी का मामला है। तो सारी इंटैलीजेंस एजेंसीज में कोऑर्डिनेशन की बहुत जरूरत है, स्टेट पुलिस और सेंट्रल पुलिस के बीच कोऑर्डिनेशन की बहुत जरूरत है। इस के लिए एक सेक्युरिटी मैनेंजमेंट का इफैक्टिव सिस्टम होना चाहिए।

4.00 P.M.

महोदय, दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चहूंगा कि हालांकि यह सवाल इंटरनल सेक्युरिटी का है, लेकिन कहीं-कहीं फॉरेन पॉलिसी डिसीजंस भी उस पर असर डालते हैं। अभी अमेरिका से 11 सितंबर के बाद हमारी जो कुरबत है, उसका भी प्रभाव हमारी इंटरनल सेक्युरिटी पर पड़ा है और जो विदेशी ताकतें हैं, जेहादी ताकतें हैं, जो हमारे देश की दुश्मन ताकतें हैं-पाकिस्तान है, अल-कायदा है, या दूसरे लोग हैं, वे इस का फायदा उठाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान को निशाना बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार इस के ऊपर सोचे कि इसे किस तरह काउंटर करना है। आप इसे काउंटर सिर्फ किसी एक कम्युनिटी को निशाना बनाकर या उस के ऊपर आतंकवाद का लेबल लगाकर नहीं कर सकते। हमारे दूसरे साथी कहते हैं Although all Muslims are not terrorists, why all terrorists are Muslims. यह बहुत ही नासमझी की बात है और वे यह भी कहते हैं कि इसका कोई जवाब नहीं है। मैं। उन से कहना चाहता हूं कि मेरे भाई जरा सा

सोच लो, जवाब ही जवाब है। क्या नक्सलाइट्स मुसलमान थे, क्या उल्फा मुसलमान हैं, क्या राजीव गांधी को कत्ल करने वाले मुसलमान थे, क्या इंदिरा जी को कत्ल करने वाले मुसलमान थे, क्या नॉर्थ ईस्ट में जो सारा टैरेरिज्म चल रहा है, वे मुसलमान हैं, क्या माओस्टि मुसलमान हैं और क्या एल॰टी॰टी॰ई॰ मुसलमान हैं? इसलिए यह कह देना गलत है। हां, यह सच है कि कुछ इलाकों में, हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर कुछ जगहों पर यह हुआ है और यह भी सच है कि कश्मीर में आज जो लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं, उस में ज्यादा तादाद मुसलमानों की है, लेकिन यह भी सच है कि कश्मीर में 20 साल के टैरेरिज्म के बावजूद हिन्दूस्तान का एक भी मुसलमान, ग्लोबल टैरेरिज्म को भूल जाइए, अल-कायदा को भूल जाइए, कश्मीर के आतंकवाद के साथ नहीं जुड़ा है। उस ने यह कहा है कश्मीरियो हम तुम्हारी हिफाजत करेंगे, हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बन जाओ, हिन्दुस्तान में तुम्हारी इज्जत है, हिन्दुतान में तुम्हारा मुस्तकबिल है। हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान तुम्हारे लिए जान दे देगा, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान से बहार जाने की बात मत सोचना। अगर सोचोगे तो हम तुमसे लड़ेगे। बदतरीन मुसलमान ने भी, कश्मीरी ने भी कभी उन आतंकवादियों का समर्थन नहीं किया। जिसे आप कम्युनल मुसलमान कहते हैं, जिसे आप कट्टरवादी कहते हैं, उसने भी साथ नहीं दिया। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा ... (समय की घंटी) ... कि यह एक बड़ा अहम मामला है।

सर, मैं दो आखिरी प्वायंट्स रख कर अपनी बात करना चाहूंगा। मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब से जानना चाहूंगा कि Do we have a carefully worked out short, medium and long-term strategy to deal with these threats politically, ideologically, ecnomically, socially and systematically? Do we have a national security apparatus capable of implementing the strategy effectively? And, do we have a political leadership at the Central level and at the State level which would consistently bat or reinvigorate the national security apparatus? सर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब तक national security apparatus को across the political spectrum, political backing नहीं मिलेगी, वह effectively काम नहीं कर पाएगा।

मैं आखिरी बात यह कहना चाहूंगा कि एक counter insurgency and counter terrorism doctrine बनाना होगा। चूंकि हम 1956 से टेररिज्म का सामना कर रहे हैं, प्रॉक्सी वार का सामना कर रहे हैं, हमने पंजाब में सामना किया, नॉर्थ-ईस्ट में तो हम बहुत पहले से ही समाना कर रहे हैं, हमारा एक न्यूक्लियर डॉक्ट्रिन है, हमारे दूसरे डॉक्ट्रिंस भी है, लेकिन हमारा counter insurgency and counter terrorism doctrine नहीं है। हमें इस पर एक डॉक्ट्रिन देश के सामने पेश करना होगा, पार्लियामेंट में उस पर गौर करना होगा। वह comprehensive होना चाहिए। law and order का सवाल नहीं होना चाहिए। वह ऐसा होना चाहिए कि वे different groups, जो आने वाले वक्त में terrorism के विक्टिम्स बन सकते हैं, उनका शिकार बन सकते हैं, विक्टिम से मेरी मुराद यह है कि terrorists उन्हें terrorists अपने जाल में फंसाने की कोशिश कर सकते हैं, वे cannon fodder बन सकते हैं, उनके हथियार बन सकते हैं और इस देश में ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं,

जो यह बन सकते हैं, तो उसे काउंटर करने के लिए क्या socio-economic strategy है? जो सपमदंजमक हैं, उनका alienation दूर करने की क्या strategy है? क्योंकि सर, अगर हम alienation दूर नहीं करेंगे, खास तौर पर minorities के alienation को, तो हमारी इस बात के बावजूद कि हम पूरी ताकत के साथ हिन्दुस्तानी हैं, आतंकवादी कुछ लोगों को फुसलाने में कामयाब होंगे और उसके लिए आतंकवादी ही जिम्मेदार नहीं होगा, हम और हमारा देश भी पूरी तरह से जिम्मेदार होंगे। आपका बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया। धन्यवाद।

†[شری شاہد صدیقی ''اتر پردیش'' : اُپ سبھاپتی مہودے، میں سب سے پہلے تو مجھ سے پہلے جو دونوں اسپیکر بولے ہیں، انہیں بدھائی دینا چاہتا ہوں اور اس دیش کی عام جنتا اور سیکورٹی فورسیز کو بدھائی دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ جس طرح سے ہم نے پارٹی پالیٹکس سے اوپر اٹھ کر اور آپس کے اختلافات سے اوپر اٹھ کر، پچھلے بیس سال سے آتنک واد کا مقابلہ کیا ہے، میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ دنیا میں اسکی دوسری مثال نہیں ملتی ہے. یہ مسئلہ ایسا ہے کہ اس پر اگر ہم پلیم گیم کھیلیں گے تو ہم دیش کے ساتھ انیائے کریں گے اور آتنک وادیوں کی سہائتہ کریں گے. اس لئے میری کوشش یہ ہوگی کہ ایمانداری سے جو باتیں میں محسوس کرتا ہوں کہ انٹرنل سیکورٹی کو زیادہ پختہ بنانے کے لئے ضروری ہے میں ان کو کہوں. اگر اس میں کہیں کسی کے ماضی کے کاموں کی کوئی آلوچنا ہوتی ہے تو اس کا مقصد میرا کسی کو بلیم کرنا نہیں ہے، بلکہ میرا مقصد یہ ہے کہ اس سے ہم سبق سیکھ کر آگے کے لئے آتنک واد کا مقابلہ درڑتا کے ساتھ، ایکتا کے ساتھ متحد ہو کر کر سکیں.

سر، سب سے پہلے تو میں ایک بات کہنا چاہوں گا کہ جب ہم سیکورٹی کی بات کرتے ہیں تو صرف بارڈر کی، زمین کی، پہاڑوں کی بات نہیں کرتے ہیں. جب ہم سیکورٹی کی بات کرتے ہیں تو ہمارے سامنے دیش کی سیکورٹی کے سوال پر، فوڈ سیکورٹی ایک بڑا اہم مسئلہ ہے، کمیونل سیکورٹی ایک بہت بڑا مسئلہ ہے، ایک انڈو بیجوئل کی سیکورٹی، یہ بھی ایک بہت بڑا مسئلہ ہے کیوں کہ سب آپس میں جڑے ہوئے ہیں. کسی راشٹر کی سیکورٹی اپنے آپ میں ویکیوم میں نہیں ہوتی ہے، آئسولیشن میں نہیں ہوتی ہے. راشٹر کی

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

سیکورٹی اس کی فوڈ سیکورٹی، اس کی ایجوکیشنل سیکورٹی سب کے ساتھ جڑی ہوتی ہے۔ یہاں پر وقت نہیں ہے، ورنہ ان چیزوں پر اس سدن کے اندر بحث ہونی چاہئے کہ ہماری جو ایجوکیشنل اور سوشل سیکورٹی ہے، اس کا کیا پرابلم پڑ رہا ہے، یہ جو ہماری فوڈ سیکورٹی ہے، اس کا ہمارے فکسلواد کے بڑھنے میں کیا پرابلم پڑ رہا ہے، دنگے ہونے میں کیا پرابلم پڑ رہا ہے کیوں کہ فکسلواد کوئی ہماری مٹی میں سے جنم نہیں لیتا ہے۔ فکسلواد نے ہماری پرمپرا اور ہمارے دھرم سے جنم نہیں لیا ہے۔

اپ سبھاپتی مہودے، فکسلواد نے اگر جنم لیا ہے، تو ہمارے سارے سماجی سوالوں سے جڑی ہوئی جو غلطیاں ہیں، ہم نے پچھلے ۶۰ سالوں میں یا اس سے پہلے جو غلطیاں کی ہیں، اس میں اس کا بھی دوش ہے، اس کے بارے میں بھی ہم کو بات کرنی ہوگی کیوں کہ جب تک ایک national consensus نہیں ہوگا، ایک national understanding نہیں ہوگی کہ ہمیں کس طرح سے آتنک واد کا مقابلہ کرنا ہے، تب تک یہ نہیں ہوگا کیونکہ آتنک واد کا مقابلہ صرف سیکورٹی فورسیز سے، ان کو صرف ہتھیار دینے سے، صرف ہیلی کاپٹر دینے سے، صرف آرمس دینے سے نہیں ہوگا، آتنک واد کا مقابلہ لوگوں کو بھروسہ دینے سے، ان کا بھروسہ جیتنے سے، ان کا ایک felling of belonging دینے سے ہوگا۔ یہ جو alienation ہے، چاہے وہ alienation مائناریٹیز میں ہے، چاہے وہ ریجنل گروپس میں ہے، چاہے ہمارے کشمیری پنڈتوں میں ہے، یہ sense of alienation کسی بھی دیش کے لئے سب سے بڑی خطرناک چیز ہوتی ہے۔ اس sense of alienation کو دور کرنے کے لئے political leadership کو سامنے آنا ہوگا اور میں بہت ادب کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہماری پالیٹکل لیڈرشپ کہیں نہ کہیں فیل ہوئی ہے۔ پچھلے ۲۰-۲۵ سالوں میں ہماری پالیٹکل لیڈرشپ فیل ہوئی ہے، اس سینس میں نہیں کہ ہم آتنک واد سے لڑ نہیں پائے، یہ اس سینس میں فیل ہوئی ہے کہ ہم پارٹی پالیٹکس سے اوپر اٹھ کر، اپنے چھوٹے چھوٹے ہتوں سے اوپر اٹھ کر راشٹریہ ہت میں ایک پالیسی پر consensus نہیں بنا پائے اور جب تک اس طرح کے ایشوز پر consensus نہیں ہوتا، چاہے

---

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

یہ فارن پالیسی ہو، چاہے یہ انٹرنل سیکورٹی ہو، تب تک کیا ہوتا ہے کہ جب ہمارے بیچ ٹکراؤ ہوتا ہے، تو اس کا فائدہ ہمارے ورودھی اٹھاتے ہیں، چاہے وہ اندرونی ہوں، چاہے باہری ہوں. اس کے لئے ہمیں ایک پالیسی بنانی ہوگی، جس میں ہمیں بلیم گیم سے نکلنا ہوگا.

اپ سبھاپتی مہودے، ابھی تک جو ووٹ بنک کی پالیٹکس ہوتی رہی ہے، وہ ہر طرف سے ہوئی ہے، اس کا ہمیں علاج ڈھونڈنا ہوگا. فاروق صاحب، میں ڈیٹیل میں نہیں جانا چاہتا، چاہے وہ افضل گرو کا معاملہ ہے، چاہے وہ گجرات کے دنگوں کا معاملہ ہے، چاہے وہ ۱۹۹۳ کے ممبئی میں جو دنگے ہوئے، ان کا معاملہ ہے، ہم طرح طرح سے ووٹ بنک پالیٹکس کرتے رہے ہیں، یہ دیش کے ہت میں نہیں ہے. اس لئے میں کہتا ہوں کہ اس میں پالیٹکل لیڈرشپ کا کہیں نہ کہیں فیلیور رہے. اس سے ہمیں اوپر اٹھنا ہوگا اور ہمیں سینسبلو ہونا پڑے گا اور مائنارٹیز کی جو گریونسز ہیں. ethical, religious and social ان کے بارے میں ہمیں زیادہ سینسبلو ہونا پڑے گا، یہ میرا آپ سے کہنا ہے.

اُپ سبھاپتی مہودے، مجھے ایک بات اور کہنی ہوگی کہ ہماری جو انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز ہیں، ان کا بھی کہیں فیلیور رہے اور ہم اس کو کہتے ہوئے ڈرتے اور گھبراتے ہیں اور جو کہتا ہے، اس کو کہہ دیا جاتا ہے کہ شاید یہ دیش کے ہت میں بات نہیں کر رہا ہے، لیکن ہمیں سمجھنا پڑے گا کہ چونکہ ان انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز کا کوئی لیکھا جوکھا نہیں ہوتا، یہاں راء کے اوپر کوئی بحث نہیں ہوتی، یہاں آئی. بی. کے اوپر یا دوسری ایجنسیز کے اوپر کوئی بحث نہیں ہوتی ہے، ان ایجنسیز کے لوگ بھاگ بھاگ کر امریکہ چلے جاتے ہیں، کس طرح سے دیش کے ہتوں کو قربان کرتے ہیں، کس طرح سے باہر کے دیشوں کو یہاں کی جانکاری بیچتے ہیں، کس طرح سے اندر غلط رپورٹنگ کرتے ہیں، کیسے راجنیتک دلوں کے اشارے پر وہ کام کرتے ہیں. جب انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز کسی راجنیتک دلوں کے اشارے پر کام کریں گی. چاہے یہ ہوں، چاہے ہم ہوں، کوئی بھی ہو، تو پھر انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز ایک پالیٹکل ٹول بن جاتی ہے، اگر وہ پالیٹکل ٹول بن جاتی ہیں تو ان کی آزادی، انکی ایمانداری ختم ہو جاتی ہے اور یہ ایجنسیاں اس طرح سے کام کرتی ہیں جس سے دیش کا نقصان ہوتا ہے اور یہ نقصان ہم کافی وقت سے دیکھ رہے ہیں.

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

اپ سبھا پی مہودے، اس سندربھ میں میں ایک بات بہت ایمانداری کے ساتھ کہنا چاہتا ہوں اور میں چاہوں گا کہ میرے ساتھی اس پر بھڑکیں نہیں، میں کسی کو بھڑکانے کے لئے نہیں کر رہا ہوں، یہ اخباروں میں، میگزین میں، سب جگہ رپورٹ آئی ہے اور سچر کمیشن نے بھی کہا ہے کہ انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز میں مائناریٹیز کو، خاص طور پر مسلمانوں کو باہر رکھا گیا ہے اور آج انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز وقت محسوس کر رہی ہے کیونکہ اردو میں اتنا کچھ آتا ہے، ہمیں پاکستان کی خبر رکھنی ہے، ہمیں افغانستان کی خبر رکھنی ہے، ہمیں دوسرے علاقوں کی خبر رکھنی ہے، لیکن وہاں پر ایسے لوگ موجود نہیں ہے، جو اس پر بہت ایمانداری کے ساتھ سوچ سکیں. پچھلے ۶۰ سالوں میں ان کو آہستہ آہستہ باہر کر دیا گیا ہے. آج صرف چند لوگ ہیں، ورنہ اس میں مسلمان لوگ نہیں ہیں. نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے ہے انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز میں اگر یہ احساس ہو جائے کہ کوئی ایک کمیونٹی بھروسے کے لائق نہیں ہے، تو آپ نے شروعات میں ہی ان کے دل میں بیج ڈال دیا اور اس بیج سے زہر اگے گا اور یہ ایمانداری سے اس کمیونٹی کو نہیں دیکھ پائے گے.

سر، یہ وہ کمیونٹی ہے، جسے فوج میں جگہ ملی ہو یا نہ ملی ہو، لیکن شہید ہونے والوں میں وہ سب سے آگے تھے. میں حولدار عبدالحمید کی بات نہیں کرتا، میں پیٹن ٹینکوں کی بات نہیں کرتا، میں آج کی کارگل کی جنگ کی بات کرتا ہوں. کارگل کی جنگ میں ہمارے ۵۰۰ کے اوپر جوان شہید ہوئے، لیکن مجھے جہاں اس بات پر فخر ہے کہ ہمارے جوانوں نے دیش کے سرکشا کی، وہیں اس بات پر بھی فخر ہے کہ میں ہندوستانی مسلمان ہوں اور یہاں سے ہمارے ۴۸ نوجوان تھے، جبکہ مرنے والوں میں ۸.۵ فیصد ہیں. جب جب آپ نے موقع دیا ہے، جب جب اس دیش نے موقع دیا ہے، ہم نے ثابت کیا ہے کہ دیش کی سرکشا کے سوال پر ہم کسی سے کم نہیں ہیں، ہم سب سے آگے ہیں. اس لئے میں کہوں گا کہ اس کمی کو ہوم منسٹر صاحب دور کریں، جو انٹیلی جینس ایجنسیز میں ایک bias ہے اور لوگوں میں alienation ہے. وہ bias دیش کے ہت کے خلاف کام کرتا ہے. اس سے آتنک واد کو پکڑنے میں فائدہ نہیں ملتا. ابھی ممبئی میں جو تذکرہ ہوا، میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں یہ ممبئی ہو یا کہیں اور، کئی بار ایسا ہوتا ہے کہ پولیس کے اوپر دباؤ ہوتا ہے یہ جلدی سنے جلدی کیس سولو کرو اور پولیس دباؤ میں کچھ لوگوں کو پکڑ کر، جن کے خاص نام ہوتے ہیں، خاص

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

چہرے ہوتے ہیں، جو خاص قسم کی ٹوپیاں پہنتے ہیں، انہیں میڈیا کے سامنے آگے کر دیتے ہیں. بعد میں ثبوت ملے یا نہ ملے، اسے بعد میں دیکھا جاتا ہے. اس لئے مکوکہ کی ضرورت پڑتی ہے، اس لئے ٹاڈا کی ضرورت پڑتی ہے اور اس لئے ٹاڈا، پوٹا، مکوکہ، سب فیل ہو جاتے ہیں. ان کے کنوکشن کا ریٹ ۴ فیصد بھی نہیں ہوتا، اس لئے کہ اکثر بے گناہوں کو پکڑا جاتا ہے. اس میں گڑبڑ کیا ہے؟ جب بے گناہ پکڑے جاتے ہیں، تو اصلی گناہ گار نکل جاتے ہیں. ایک جھوٹ بولا جاتا ہے، اس جھوٹ کے چھپانے کے لئے ۱۰ جھوٹ بولنے پڑتے ہیں اور جب ۱۰ جھوٹ بولے جاتے ہین، تو جو آتنک وادی ہے، جو دیش کے دشمن ہیں، جو باہر سے آنے والے ہیں، وہ تو نکل جاتے ہیں، ہم کچھ لوگوں کو بہانہ بنا کر اپنے سینے پر تمغہ لگا لیتے ہیں. میں یہ کوئی عجیب بات نہیں کہہ رہا ہوں. ہماری فوج کے کیسز آئے ہیں کہ جہاں پر ہم نے لوگوں کو پکڑ کر مارا ہے، فلمیں بنائی ہیں اور یہ دکھایا ہے کہ ہم نے باہر سے آنے والے آتنک وادیوں کو، جہادیوں کو مار دیا. اپنے لوگوں کو نما ٹو سوس ڈال ڈال کر دکھایا ہے، فاروق صاحب کو معلوم ہے اور اس کے اوپر کافی کچھ میڈیا میں آیا ہے. ہم پیسے دیکر جھوٹے سرینڈر دکھاتے ہیں، آتنک وادی آ کر سرینڈر کرتے ہیں، وہ کوئی آتنک وادی نہیں ہوتے، وہ گاؤں کے لڑکے ہوتے ہیں. ہماری فوج میڈل لگوا لیتی

سر، پولیس، بھی ایسا کرتی ہے. ایسا نہیں ہے کہ پولیس ایسا کام نہیں کر رہی ہے. اس لئے ہمیں اس چیز کے اوپر اٹھانا پڑے گا. آج میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ممبئی میں جو کچھ ہو رہا ہے یا مالے گاؤں میں جو کچھ ہوا ہے، ہم نے پردھان منتری جی سے بھی بات کی تھی، ہم سارے ایم. پیز. جمع ہو کر ہوم منسٹر صاحب کے پاس بھی گئے، ہم مہاراشٹر کے چیف منسٹر صاحب کے پاس بھی گئے، لیکن ہم کو انصاف نہیں ملا. یہ جو alienation ہے، یہ بہت خطرناک ہے. ہمارے دشمن تاک میں بیٹھے ہیں. وہ اس alienation کا پورا فائدہ اٹھانا چاہتے ہیں. ہم انہیں اس کا فائدہ نہیں اٹھانے دیں گے، مجھے اس بات کا وشواس ہے. لیکن ہمارا کام مشکل ہو جائے گا. ہمارا کام مشکل بنا رہی ہے. بعض ایڈمنسٹرینو گروپس، بعض انٹیلی جینس گروپ. اپنے چھوٹے چھوٹے فائدے کے لئے ہم اس کام کو مشکل بنا رہے ہیں.

---

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

سر، میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ایودھیا کا تذکرہ ہوا کہ وہاں پر آتنک وادی حملہ ہوا، ہمارے وارانسی میں آتنک وادی حملہ ہوا، ابھی ممبئی میں ٹرین کے اوپر آتنک وادی حملہ ہوا۔ ہم نے پاکستان سے کہا کہ آپ کا ہاتھ ہے، ہمارے پاس ثبوت ہیں۔ ابھی جب پچھلے دنوں پاکستان سے ہوم سکریٹری آئے اور بات چیت ہوئی، تو ہم نے انہیں کیا پیش کیا؟ ممبئی کا نہیں، بلکہ ان کے سامنے وارانسی کا کیس پیش کیا، کیوں کہ ہم نے اسے سولو کر لیا تھا۔ ہم نے ایودھیا کا کیس پورا کا پورا چند ہفتے کے اندر سولو کر کے آتنک وادیوں کو پکڑ کر، انہیں مٹا کے سب چیزیں دیش کے سامنے رکھ دیں۔ ہمیں اس کے لئے راجنیتی سے اوپر اٹھ کی اتر پردیش کی ایس۔ٹی۔ایف۔ کو بدھائی دینی ہوگی۔ اگر آپ اس پر راجنیتی کریں گے۔ صرف اس لئے کہ یہ ایس۔ٹی۔ایف۔ اتر پردیش کی ہے، کیونکہ اتر پردیش میں آپ کی اور آپ کی سرکار نہیں ہے، تو یہ غلط ہوگا، پولیس کے ساتھ انیائے ہوگا، اس دیش کے ان لوگوں کے ساتھ انیائے ہوگا، جو ایمانداری سے کام کر رہے ہیں۔ اگر ایسا ہی تھا، تو ممبئی کے جو دھماکے ہوئے تھے، آپ اس کا پورا کیس پاکستان کے سامنے رکھتے، انہیں کٹگھرے میں کھڑا کر دیتے، لیکن آپ نے کیا رکھا۔ وارانسی کا کیس، کیونکہ اتر پردیش کی پولیس نے وارانسی کا کیس شاندار طریقے سے سولو کیا تھا اور اس کے لئے ہمیں انہیں بدھائی دینی چاہئے۔ لیکن ہوتا یہ ہے یہ ہم راجنیتی کرتے ہیں۔ میں یہ نہیں کہہ رہا ہوں کہ میں راجنیتی نہیں کرتا ہوں، راجنیتی ہم سب کرتے ہیں۔ سر، یہی ایک بڑی کمزوری ہے، جس سے ہمیں باہر نکلنا ہوگا اور ہمیں اسے دیکھنا ہوگا کہ ہم اس طرح کی راجنیتی نہ کریں۔

ابھی نکسلائٹ موومنٹ کے بارے میں کہا گیا کہ نکسل موومنٹ ہماری انٹرنل سیکورٹی کے لئے بہت بڑا خطرہ ہے۔ یہ پچھلے دنوں بڑھا ہے۔ یہ میں نے نہیں کہا، ہوم منسٹر صاحب نے کہا ہے اور دوسرے لوگوں نے کہا ہے کہ نکسل موومنٹ نیپال سے لیکر ساؤتھ تک ایک ریڈ کاریڈور کے روپ میں بنا ہے۔

وزیر داخلہ "شری شیوراج پاٹل": آپ جس طرح سے بہت ساری باتیں ڈال رہے ہیں، یہ غلط ہے۔ آپ مجھے ملے ہی نہیں ہیں۔ میں نے کاریڈور کی بات بھی نہیں کی ہے۔ آپ اور بھی بہت ساری باتیں بتا رہے ہیں اور میں یہاں بیٹھا ہوا ہوں۔

---

†[ ] Transliteration of Urdu Script.

شری شاہد صدیقی : پچھلے سال اخبار میں آپ کا بیان نکسلائٹ کے بارے میں آیا تھا۔

SHRI SHIVRAJ VISHWANATH PATIL: I have never said that....(Interruptions)

شری شاہد صدیقی: ہوسکتا ہے، میں غلط کہہ رہا ہوں، لیکن یہ سچائی ہے کہ ایک نکسل کاریڈور بنا ہے۔ ہوم منسٹر صاحب نے نہیں کہا ہوگا۔ اگر نہیں کہا تو بڑے افسوس کی بات ہے کہ کیوں نہیں کہا؟ یہ کاریڈور ہے، پورا دیش کہہ رہا ہے۔ پورا میڈیا کہہ رہا ہے اور ہم کہہ دیں کہ نہیں ایسا کچھ نہیں ہے، اس طرح سے تو آپ سچائی کو نکار رہے ہیں۔ آپ سچائی کو مت نکاریئے۔ یہ نکسل موومنٹ پاکستان کی دین نہیں ہے، یہ بنگلہ دیش کی دین نہیں ہے، یہ ہماری اپنی دین ہے۔ یہ ہماری کمزوریاں ہیں۔ ہم نے جس طرح سے ٹرائبل کو ٹریٹ کیا ہے، جس طرح سے ہم آج ٹرائبل کو ٹریٹ کر رہے ہیں، جنگل میں رہنے والوں کو ٹریٹ کر رہے ہیں، آدی واسیوں کو ٹریٹ کر رہے ہیں، alienation کو بڑھا رہے ہیں، یہ اس کا نتیجہ ہے۔

مہودے، میں سرکار کو بدھائی دیتا ہوں کہ انہوں نے کم سے کم اس فیکٹ کو مانا ہے کہ نکسل موومنٹ سے ڈیل کرنے کا صرف لا اینڈ آرڈر کا طریقہ نہیں ہے بلکہ ہم سوشیو اکانمک طریقے سے چل کر اس نکسل موومنٹ سے لڑ پائیں گے۔ اس کے سوشیو اکانامک ڈائمنشنس ہیں جنہیں سمجھ کر سرکار نے کچھ پالیسیز بنائی ہیں اور اس میں آپ کے ساتھ پورا دیش رہے گا۔

مہودے، میں بات کو زیادہ آگے نہیں بڑھانا چاہتا، لیکن میں ایک بات یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ تمام چیزوں کے باوجود ایک افیکٹیو نیشنل سیکورٹی مینجمنٹ مجھے نظر نہیں آیا۔ ہوسکتا ہے کہ میری معلومات کم ہو، لیکن ایک کارڈینیٹڈ سیکورٹی مینجمنٹ سسٹم ہونا چاہئے تاکہ وہ انٹرنل اور ایکسٹرنل سیکورٹی کے بیچ کے ڈائنامک کے اوپر پوری نظر رکھ سکے۔ ابھی کیا ہوتا ہے کہ کہیں پر یہ اسٹیٹ سبجیکٹ ہے، لیکن انٹرنل سیکورٹی کا معاملہ ہے، کہیں پر کینڈر کا سبجیکٹ ہے، لیکن انٹرنل سیکورٹی کا معاملہ ہے۔ تو ساری انٹیلی جنس ایجنسیز میں کوآرڈی نیشن کی بہت ضروری ہے، اسٹیٹ پولیس اور سینٹرل پولیس کے بیچ کوآرڈی نیشن کی بہت ضرورت ہے۔ اس کے لئے ایک سیکورٹی مینجمنٹ کا افیکٹیو سسٹم ہونا چاہئے۔

مہودے، دوسری بات میں یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ حالانکہ یہ سوال انٹرنل سیکورٹی کا ہے، لیکن کہیں کہیں فارین پالیسی ڈیسزن بھی اس پر اثر ڈالتے ہیں۔ ابھی امریکہ سے ۱۱ ستمبر کے بعد ہماری جو قربت ہے، اس

††]Transliteration in Urdu Script.

کا بھی پربھاؤ ہماری انٹرنل سیکورٹی پر پڑا ہے اور جو دیشی طاقتیں ہیں، جہادی طاقتیں ہیں، جو ہمارے دیش کی دشمن طاقتیں ہیں، پاکستان ہے، القاعدہ ہے یا دوسرے لوگ ہیں، وہ اس کا فائدہ اٹھانے کی کوشش کر رہے ہیں، ہندستان کو نشانہ بنانے کی کوشش کر رہے ہیں، میں چاہونگا کہ سرکار اس کے اوپر سوچے کہ اسے کس طرح کاؤنٹر کرنا ہے۔ آپ اسے کاؤنٹر صرف کسی ایک کمیونٹی کو نشانہ بنا کر یا اس کے اوپر آتنک واد کا لیبل لگا کر نہیں کر سکتے۔ ہمارے دوسرے ساتھی کہتے ہیں Although all Muslims are not terrorists, why all terrorist are Muslims. یہ بہت ہی ناسمجھی کی بات ہے اور وہ یہ بھی کہتے ہیں کہ اس کا کوئی جواب نہیں ہے۔ میں ان سے کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ میرے بھائی زرا سا سوچ لو، جواب ہی جواب ہے۔ کیا نکسلائٹس مسلمان تھے، کیا اسفاق مسلمان ہیں، کیا راجیو گاندھی کو قتل کرنے والے مسلمان تھے، کیا اندرا جی کو قتل کرنے والے مسلمان تھے، کیا ناردھ ایسٹ میں جو سارا ٹیررزم چل رہا ہے، وہ مسلمان ہیں، کیا ماؤسٹ مسلمان ہیں اور کیا ایل ٹی ٹی ای مسلمان ہے؟ اس لئے یہ کہہ دینا غلط ہے۔ ہاں، یہ سچ ہے کہ کچھ علاقوں میں، ہندستان سے باہر کچھ جگہوں پر یہ ہوا ہے اور یہ بھی سچ ہے کہ کشمیر میں آج جو لڑائی لڑ رہے ہیں، اس میں زیادہ تعداد مسلمانوں کی ہے، لیکن یہ بھی سچ ہے کہ کشمیر میں ۲۰ سال کے ٹیررزم کے باوجود ہندستان کا ایک بھی مسلمان، گلوبل ٹیررزم کو بھول جایئے، القاعدہ کو بھول جایئے، کشمیر کے آتنک واد کے ساتھ نہیں جڑا ہے۔ اس نے یہ کہا ہے کہ کشمیریوں ہم تمہاری حفاظت کریں گے، ہندستان کا حصہ بن جاؤ، ہندستان میں تمہاری عزت ہے، ہندستان میں تمہارا مستقبل ہے۔ ہندستان کا مسلمان تمہارے لئے جان دیدیگا، لیکن ہندستان سے باہر جانے کی بات مت سوچنا۔

اگر سوچو گے تو ہم تم سے لڑیں گے۔ بدترین مسلمان نے بھی، کشمیری نے بھی ابھی ان آتنکوادیوں کا سمرتھن نہیں کیا، جسے آپ کمیونل مسلمان کہتے ہیں، جسے آپ کٹر وادی کہتے ہیں، اس نے بھی ساتھ نہیں دیا. اس لئے میں کہنا چاہوں گا...(وقت کی گھنٹی)...کہ یہ ایک بڑا اہم معاملہ ہے.

سر، میں دو آخری پوائنٹس رکھ کر اپنی بات ختم کرنا چاہوں گا. میں ہوم منسٹر صاحب سے جاننا چاہوں گا کہ Do we have a carefully worked out short, medium and long-term strategy to

†[ ]Transliteration in Urdu Script.

deal with these threats politically, ideologically, economically, socially and systematically? Do we have a national security apparatus capable of implementing the strategy effectively? And, do we have a political leadership at the Central level and at the State level which would consistently bat or reinvigorate the national security apparatus? سر میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جب تک national security apparatus کو effectively کام نہیں کرنے across the political spectrum, political backing نہیں ملے گی، وہ پائے گا۔

میں آخری بات یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ counter insurgency and counter terrorism doctrine بنانی ہوگی۔ چونکہ ہم ۱۹۵۶ سے ٹیررزم کا سامنا کر رہے ہیں، پر اکسی وار کا سامنا کر رہے ہیں، پنجاب میں ہم نے سامنا کیا، ناردھ ایسٹ میں تو ہم بہت پہلے سے سامنا کر رہے ہیں، ہمارا ایک جموں کشمیر ڈاکٹرین ہے، ہماری دوسری ڈاکٹرینس ہیں، لیکن ہماری counter insurgency and counter terrorism doctrine نہیں ہے۔ ہمیں اس پر ایک ڈاکٹرین دیش کے سامنے پیش کرنی ہوگی، پارلیمنٹ میں اس پر غور کرنا ہوگا اور وہ آل کمپریہینسو ہونی چاہئے۔ وہ لاء اینڈ آرڈر کا سوال نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ وہ ایسا ہونا چاہئے کہ یہ مختلف گروپس، جو آنے والے وقت میں ٹیریرزم کے وکٹم بن سکتے ہیں، ان کا شکار بن سکتے ہیں، وکٹم سے میری مراد یہ ہے کہ ٹیریرسٹ انہیں اپنی جال میں پھنسانے کی کوشش کر سکتے ہیں، کامن فوڈر بن سکتے ہیں، ان کے ہتھیار بن سکتے ہیں۔ اس دیش میں بہت سے لوگ ہیں، جو یہ بن سکتے ہیں۔ اسے کاؤنٹر کرنے کے لئے کیا socio-economic اسٹریٹجی ہے؟ جو alienated ہیں ان کا ایلینیشن دور کرنے کی کیا اسٹریٹجی ہے؟ کیوں کہ سر، اگر ہم alienation دور نہیں کریں گے، تو ہماری اس بات کے باوجود کہ ہم پوری طاقت کے ساتھ ہندوستانی ہیں، آتنکوادی کچھ لوگوں کو پھسلانے میں کامیاب ہوں گے اور اس کے لئے آتنکوادی ہی ذمہ دار نہیں ہوگا، ہم اور ہمارا دیش بھی پوری طرح سے ذمہ دار ہوگا، اگر ہم اس alienation کو دور نہیں کریں گے، خاص طور پر مائناریٹیز کے alienation کو۔ آپ کا بہت بہت شکریہ۔ دھنیواد۔

"ختم شد"

†[ ]Transliteration in Urdu Script.

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Thank you Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. Actually, the book that has been circulated by the Home Ministry dealt with—in figures—how security incidents, naxal violence, communal violence, have gone up in some of the States and how incidents have come down in some of the States. Abhishekji dealt elaborately with the figures. But, we have noted how extremist incidents have gone up. The number of communal incidents in 2002 was 722 and in 2005, the number increased to 779. The number of persons killed came down in 2005. In 2002, 1,130 were killed when compared to 124 in 2005. This includes the incidents of Godhra. We all know how peaceful the place of Gandhiji and Meerabai was and what is the siutation of these places today. The situation of Nepal has improved a lot. It will definitely help us in the sub-continent so far as extremist incidents are concerned and we hope for the better.

Sir, our country has witnessed some of the serious incidents of terrorist violence. The recent blasts at Malegaon, which led to the death of about 37 people and injured more than 100 people, were a very calculated attack to create communal tension and, thus, to weaken the unity of the country. Who was behind the attack? This attack had been perpetrated by the enemies of our country with a design to disrupt normal life and create social tension. And, that is the biggest danger before us. It was perpetrated by the enemies of the country. But, how the people of Malegaon displayed the best maturity and refused to be trapped set up by the terrorists, is very important. And, how the answer was given to the terrorists? The Hindus donated blood for the Muslims. The Muslims came forward to donate blood for the Hindus in the Mumbai train blast case. We have seen how the Muslims, in Malegaon, had formed a human chain and shown determination to save the hundreds of Hindu school girls, who were struck in schools. They were safely evacuated. Food, drinking water, medicines, blankets, etc. were provided immediately before any Government assistance reached there. This is another picture of brotherhood, the best answer to the terrorism. India should uphold the right of all the religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic minorities to build up a plural society. Here, I would like to quote a few lines of poet Rabindra Nath Tagore. In reply to a civic reception accorded by Dr. B.C. Roy, the then Mayor, he said, "Let not the poison of internecine strife pollute her life. Let the citizens of all races and all sects and communities unite in goodwill and keep her name untarnished and

her peace undisturbed. This is my prayer." How to fulfil the prayer of poet Rabindra Nath Tagore? What is the pre-condition of internal security? Can it be achieved by destroying mosques, destroying temples, creating communal disharmony and tension, and targeting one religion only? Only a few months before the Mumbai blasts, a large amount of RDX was recovered by police at the same place of Maharashtra. Two Bajarang Dal actives were killed while making bombs. Blasts in mosques in Parbani, Purna, Jalnia, in recent years, must also be seriously investigated. How in the Government reacting and taking action?

Sir, we know that terrorism knows no religion. The States, together with the Central Government, should ensure a coordinated action. This should be seen with utmost seriousness. The Government must take all necessary measures to strengthen internal security of the country and should identify intelligence and security lapses. Proper inquiry and punishment to the guilty should be ensured. All important places should be guarded and protected suitably.

One point has been raised here. Some say that this is taking place due to the appeasement of the minority. During the NDA rules, Parliament, the Akshardham Temple, the Red Fort, the Raghunath temple, etc. had been attacked by the terrorists. Are you to claim that had taken place due to the appeasement of the minority by the NDA? Such attacks took place when the POTA was also there. We must remember that the danger to internal security cannot be fought destablising the secular democratic character of the country.

Sir, I would like to refer to one speech of Shri Kalyan Singh. In Calcutta, in an open public meeting after demolishing the Babri Masjid, he said, "अगर यह काम किसी कांट्रेक्टर को दिया जाता, तो इतना अच्छा नहीं होता।" Such was his public speech in Calcutta. We know that minority fundamentalism and majority communalism continuously feed each other. And, in Gujarat, POTA was introduced. What did the POTA Review Committee say? It said that the arrests were not justified. The Pota Review Committee gave an ambiguous decision that more than 90 odd per cent of these people, who have been arrested under POTA in Gujarat, would have been tried under the existing law, and in no way can they be treated as conspiring in a terrorist conspiracy against the State. Such was the statement. This was the unequivocal, ambiguous decision of the POTA Review Committee.

Sir, what is civilization if the majority community cannot protect the lives of the minorities? Sir, we are discussing the internal security situation, Recently, a Computer Analyst was arrested. And the Head of the National Security Coordination Cell has revealed how a spy ring, linked to a U.S. Diplomat, was operating. In 2004, a senior Law Officer, working as an Agent of the CIA was able to finally take shelter in that country. The strategic partnership should not be allowed to work as strategic spying. Since the BJP-led Government began security and intelligence cooperation, the doors were opened to the U.S. The Indo-U.S. security collaboration should be reviewed. The UPA Government should take immediate steps to prevent security breaches, and the exact nature of the Indo-U.S. collaboration should be known to the Parliamentarians. The BJP opened the door. We want to know from the Home Minister whether the UPA will keep the door open or not?

Now, Sir, the Afzal's death sentence has been referred. It was a serious incident. Our jawans sacrificed their lives to protect this building, and this institution; a great democracy. Now, Sir, the Supreme Court has given a judgement, and the mercy petition has been submitted before the President. We all know this, and it has been referred to by some of us here, that 22 mercy petitions are pending. The oldest case is that of 1997. Even the Rajiv Gandhi's murder case is pending. The Tamil Nadu Government, as we came to know, sent a petition on 4th May, 2000 to the Central Government. It was kept pending. Only in 2005 the Home Ministry sent it to the President. Since the last 4-5 years, it has been pending. Submitting such petitions to the President is the law of the land. It is a judicial provision. The BJP has not objected to any of the petitions; none has been touched. We know, Sir. Then, why in this particular case? It is in order to communalise the situation. And, they want to take advantage of the U.P. elections. Our positions is that the law of the land should prevail. With these few words, I want to conclude. There is another speaker from my party; he will speak. I conclude my speech. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Mangani Lal Mandal. Shri C. Ramachandraiah. You might be aware of the time allotted to your party. You should speak within that time. ...*(Interruptions)*... You know the time. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am just reminding you. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, this issue has been discussed umpteen times. It is being discussed continuously because of the deterioration in the internal security situation of this country. The Home Minister has submitted a book containing the details. It is a very beautiful book, but the real situation is ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I hope you have read it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: But the real situation is not that beautiful when we see the book. Sir, irrespective of the party in power ...*(Interruptions)*... Yes; yes, so that we should not have time to go through that. Irrespective of the party in power, the situation has not improved. I am not blamming a particular Government. It may be naxalism, isurgency in North-East, or, more terrorist activities because of cross-border terrorism. So, it is rather frightening to hear that more than one-third of the country is afflicted with internal disturbance. This is a report that I read in a newspaper...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I cannot quote, but I had read in a newspaper.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You please rely upon it. I am sending it and giving it to you.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I am unable to authenticate, but what I am saying is subject to correction also. But I read that it was the Home Ministry Report, and 165 districts and 14 States are afflicted with Maoist activities.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: It is not correct.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I wish it should not be true.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have given you in writing which is authenticated. You shall have to rely upon it. I am making a statement on the floor of the House that if it is wrong, I am subject to the direction of the House and the Presiding Officer. You are relying upon something which ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, I will, definitely, rely upon you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir this was circulated only today ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You sign it and give it; we will rely upon you. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, you being the Minister, you will have access to the information; whereas, we don't have that facility. So, we have to rely upon the information whatever appears in the newspapers. I am handicapped.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: May I say that whatever appears in the newspapers cannot be brought to the House unless and until you go into it and authenticate that what has appeared in the newspaper is correct. This is the rule.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, should I ask the editor of a newspaper to authenticate it first, so that I can present it here?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Not the editor, you have to do it.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: But, you can, at least, accept that you have pressed the panic button.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: This is not correct.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: No, at least, you can accept that you have pressed the panic button of the internal situation in the country.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Not at all.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: And, you said, Sir, that vital installations were going to be the targets.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: No; again, I am going to say that I have not made that statement. That statement is incorrect, and I don't know how it appeared in the newspapers...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, for everything, contradiction is coming...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: No, no; what can I do? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ramachandraiah, when the Home Minister is saying categorically, you should accept. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: No, no, Sir, I am accepting his statement.

But we have our limitations. That is what I am saying. How do I get the information? Should I sit on the chair of Home Secretary and take the files? ...*(Interruptions)*... I read in the newspapers that nuclear installations were going to be targeted, vital installations were going to be targeted. If it is a contradictory news, how can I know? Should I sit on the chair of Home Secretary and summon the files, so that I can get the authentic information? That is the only source of information I am getting. And, in spite of the Right to Information Act, I am unable to get information from the concerned Departments ...*(Interruptions)*... This has created jitters. Honestly, Sir, this has created jitters. But what exactly are the plans of the Government to avert it? Because in spite of so many refusals, every day, a number of incidents are happening. I am not blaming a particular Government, or, a particular Minister. This is happening. What is true is happening. Why didn't it happen in the US, after that incident? Why didn't it happen in the US? Why is it continuously happening in India? What are the reasons? Have ever the Government inquired about it, made a research about it? What exactly are the reasons that are contributing to this? And, Sir, I will, again, have to go to the newspapers, because that is the only source of information I have got. On the floor of the House, hon. Minister, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, said that ISI's involvement is there in terrorist activities in this country. In the recent blast in Maharashtra, the Police Chief has admitted that ISI involvement is there ...*(Interruptions)*... But the Security Adviser, Shri Narayan, says, that there is no clinching information. What is this ambiguity? Whom do we believe? Where is the clarity? The Indians are totally in darkness, as far as the terrorist activities, terrorism and internal security situation is concerned. And, we do not know whom we should believe or whom we should not believe. The Ministry of Home Affairs says one thing, and the Security Adviser says another thing. The IB Chief advises one thing, and immediately the hon. Prime Minister will refute that thing. It was said, "The existing laws are not sufficient to deal with the special crimes." That was the sum and substance of Mr. Narshiman's opinion. so, he wants special laws. More stringent provisions have to be incorporated. But immediately the Prime Minister said that there is no necessity of it. Why? Now, if the existing laws are so stringent, so punitive, why the crime rate has not been reduced, why the situation has not been improved? Who are responsible for this? It is not a question of present Government or past Government. I am not blaming a particular Government. Who is responsible for it? And what is the role of the Government in containing

these terrorist activities in this country? We have been continuously blaming one community or the other. Where is the end of it? Have you ever enquired why the people of a particular comunity are going and being trained in other countries and coming back and going to the extent of damaging their own nation? There is a reason for it. There is a reason for everything. We have to enquire it, as the U.K. has done it. The U.K. has done it, and they have succeded in it. so, let us go through it. Make a research as to what exactly are the reasons for it. Let us address those problems. Every speaker has very eloquently presented his case, and everybody is saying that vote-bank politics should not be there. I have heard this phrase a number of times in this House. But even today majority of the parties are going for vote-bank politics. they are going for vote-bank politics. To what extent they are sincere to their words which they have been saying here? And one party's political spectrum is so divided and so self-serving that it wants to take advantage of every situation. One party takes advantage of majority community, another party takes advantage of the minority community. In fact, nobody is championing the cause of any community. They are championing their own causes. That is a very hard fact, Sir, It is naked truth. Unfortunately or fortunately, our internal situation is identified with the foreign policy of the country. To what extent this country has been successful in being friendly with the neighbouring countries? what is the Gujaral Doctrine? Except Bhutan, with whom we are good friends; we are just friends. Take China; also Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Why have you been failing in being friendly with the neighbouring countries? What is the advantage of being inimical to those countries? No real thinking, pondering, is being done in the Government. Dr. Abdullah is here. In Kashmir, they have been demanding autonomy, and the party in power for so many years want to behave like a policeman or as a Mughal emperor. They never thought that autonomy should be given to Kashmir. So, it is my firm conviction that that has led to the thinking of separatism and extremism. So, let us be very realistic in addressing these problems. Let us be very realistic. You have been trying to create some satellites in the country, which you can control from Delhi, totally disregarding the local aspirations. That was the reason why so many regional parties have cropped up in this country. Have you ever thought of it? I am a product of a regional party. The regional parties are cropping up because people are aspiring for it; the people are demanding it. It is because the national parties have failed to

deliver the goods. Sir, these are the problems the country is facing, and about which the party in power has to think.

Sir, take the case of Sri Lanka. Once I read in newspapers that Indira Gandhi said that it was our strategic region. But what happened to it? It all happened because of our irrational foreign policy towards Sri Lanka. Because Pakistan is supplying arms to Sri Lanka, we are also supplying radars to Sri Lanka. Their officers are being trained on our side. Why, Sir? It is to kill the Tamilians there? What is the Foreign Policy that you are adopting? There is no rational thinking or rational policy. And you make claims that it is in the interests of the nation! It is not at all so. You can achieve eight per cent growth rate, but it can never be an inclusive growth as long as this internal problem exists; it can never be inclusive. And, we have been totally depending on the US.

Who is responsible for the rise of Taliban, Sir? Who had strengthened Saddam Hussein in the earlier stages to contain Islamic leaders in Iran? It was the US. They have been trying to fulfil their own designs, to subserve their own interests. We, being prudent rulers of this country, should have our own national interest in our minds. You can't place all the egges in the US basket. If the US is really sincere to us, if it is really a friend of India, let it control Pakistan so that the ISI does not fund terrorist activities in this country. Can we do it? Can we use any control on the United States so that it does not finance, does not arm, Pakistan, which in turn is financing ISI, and which in turn finances terrorist activities in our country?

I think the US concept of terrorism is confined to their own country, not to India, Containing terrorism cannot be area specific. These are all hard facts that need to be taken into consideration.

Sir, irrespective of the so many economic losses of this country, even today we are unable to control the flow of funds to terrorist organisations in this country. Hawala functions even more efficiently than the established banks. Hawala system in this country is functining even in the remotest parts of the country and the credibility of the Hawala system is so perfect that a bank may refuse to hobour its cheques but Hawala will not. That is the netowork we have developed. What has the Government been doing? Have we ever tried to demolish this system? Money-laundering is there and country-to-country financing is there. Country-to-terrorist financing is there. Transfer of funds from one terrorist organisation to the other is there.

There are umpteen number of ways and methods through which funds are being flown. This channel has to be demolished. Unless this is demolished, it is very difficult to control.

Then, Sir, of course, it is State subject. State Governments don't have that type of machinery, that type of resources, to control this type of terrorism in the country. The country requires federal laws. There are umpeteen number of reports. Even the Vohra Committee Report - I read part of that report... (*Time-bell*)... Sir, I shall take a few minutes more.

Federal laws need to be there. It is very unfortunate that the hon. Prime Minister has refused to accept the recommendations made by Narasimhan, with all his experience. I think Narasimhan is one of the finest officers of this country who, with all his experience, has made these suggestions. When existing laws are insufficient to combat this menace, what is wrong with having a special law? You have diluted POTA. I have no objections to that as long as you control terrorist organisations. You have diluted so many laws. It has been proven time and again that the existing laws have been inadequate. Parliament is quite willing to confer the powers on you to contain this menace. We shall support you. Please come forward with a Bill. (*interruptions*)

Then Sir, this is with regard to the disposal of cases. It is very unfortunate that these Bombay blasts took place in 1993. But, till date the entire judgement is yet to be delivered. It is 14 years now. Why not have fast track courts or court martials? Why should not we have them? Let us have a consensus.... (*interruptions*) Does it take 14 years to deliver the judgement? What type of sincerity are you showing in containing terrorism? Whatever deficiencies exist in containing it, we should remove those and confer more powers with the Government so that they can effectively eradicate this menace. Now, you have come out with a new mechanism, that is, India-Pakistan Anti-terrorism Institutional Mechanism. I don't know the modalities of the mechanism but I am an optimist by conviction and pessimist by experience. I don't know to what extent this will be effectively dealt with. It is like asking Dawood Ibrahim to enquire about the Bombay blast. Sir, Pakistan is the source of terrorism. It is harbouring and selling terrorism and the foreign policy of Pakistan is depending on terrorism. When such is the case, I am rather sceptical, as most of the Indians should be, that this mechanism will work and deliver the goods. But having tried so many methods, let us try this one also. If it is at all confidential,

you need not tell about it, but our request is that you fully equip the Government to deal with the situation. It is not as simple as it appears to be. It is a highly explosive situation. Even the mosques and temples are not safe in this country; irrigation projects are not safe and this has been extended to south India now. Recently, Andhra Pradesh Government unearthed 500 rockets. This is the situation. We cannot be complacent. If you need more laws and more powers, introduce the bills. We can request all the parties to arrive at consensus to confer you more powers. But you have to safeguard our borders. I think 5000 km. coast is their in India, which is not at all safe. Anybody can enter the Bay of Bengal coast. I have read in the newspaper that you are going to spend Rs. 400 crores on the creation of coast guard police.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: We are giving it to the State Government.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Coast guards are there and their area of jurisdiction is 200 nautical miles or so, and civil police is also there. I don't think that there is necessity to create coast guard police also.

Kindly think it over. Creation of more organisations is not going to serve the purpose. Strengthening of the existing organisations will serve the purpose. Sir, lastly, we have been blaming a particular community. Let us think it over. Why are these things happening? Do some research; there is no use of blaming anybody. Try to introduce some reforms. Try to find out the deficiencies that a particular community is facing and solve them so that they will be totally integrated in the mainstream of life. Thank you.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this very important debate. The threat to internal security is one of the major problems being faced by the country since Independence.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI) in the Chair]

Therefore, this is not the first time that the House is debating on this important issue. This issue was discussed, to a certain extent, in the last Session also and this debate is important only because here the accused people are terrorists who always try to kill the innocent people. And, this debate might go on for hours together. The question before me is whether this debate is going to be useful or is going to be a usual debate without results. I, for one, personally feel that the facts are known to everybody.

Remedies are to be suggested, and as one of the earlier speakers has mentioned here, we must be all united and honest in our approach to find out a solution to the problem. Sir, the present situation, as we find it, and while initiating the debate, as Mr. Arun Jaitley has rightly said that Jammu and Kashmir, North-Easter areas and from the point of view of naxalite problem, many parts of the country are the places where internal security is a serious problem. The Pakistan-sponsored terrorism has claimed the lives of 29,152 people. These were the civilians whose lives were claimed. About 5,101 security personnel also lost their lives. This has caused 4,730 explosions and rendered about 2,78,601 people homelss. I am mentioning these figures only because we must understand the seriousness of the problem. Sir, the loss to private and public properties is about Rs. 3,000 crores. So, it seems that throughout the country, so far, the Governments have to deal with — whether the local Governments or the Central Government—three problems which were always mentioned. One was the problem of drinking water; the other was the problem of food; and, third problem was the education. Some more problems were also there like health, etc. Now, I think the country may have to add one more problem, that is, safety of life. In this House, we may say anything, but it is true that particularly in metros, the people are scared that their lives will be in danger at any point of time. I am not talking about the remote areas, but the places which are active and where people are always worried whether they would see tomorrow or not. It is only because of the incidents that have taken place so far, particularly in places like Mumbai and Delhi, that people are not safe. Therefore, in addition to essential matters which I mentioned earlier, safety and security has also become a very serious problem which the country is facing today. I remember, the hon. Prime Minister once said that the use of Fidayeen/suicide bombers for targeting our religious places, and vital installations including economic and nuclear establishments and Army camps was very much on the agenda of terrorist outfits. I am not going into whether it has appeared in the newspaper or not, but this is my information that the Prime Minister also expressed a possibility to attacks on vital installations. Therefore, Sir, this cannot be forgotten that immediate actions are necessary. Immediate care has to be taken and I also know how serious, how difficult it is to control these attacks for various reasons. One of the actions, which we have taken in Jammu and Kashmir, is that we have banned several organisations like Jaish-e-Mohammed, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hazbul Muzahideen (they have

changed the name), Harkat-ul-Muzahideen and several organisations have been banned.

But is the Government seriously considering that after banning these organisations also, the activities of terrorists have not stopped. In order to stop such activities, in order to see that the Jammu and Kashmir issues do not become serious, the autonomy was available to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Sir, this autonomy was given to them right from the beginning. They have a different set of Constitution, and, in article 370 of our Constitution, there are provisions that gave autonomy to Jammu and Kashmir. It was for a certain period that this autonomy was expected to remain but we are aware that this could not happen and with this autonomy also, the expected results could not be achieved. Still, the infiltration is going on, the sufferings of the people are increasing. In some parts of Jammu and Kashmir, people are leaving their places and trying to find out a place for them elsewhere in India. The problems of naxalites are mainly in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and also in some parts of Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. These are the areas which are affected by naxalites.

Sir, according to my information, one-third of the country is affected by some kind of internal disturbance. The question is whether we have been able to stop this, whether after this debate, something will come out. Sir, it is said that 165 Districts in 14 States are affected by Maoists activities. Sir, I do not want to go into the figures. The question before us very simple. Before this, I would like to refer to a question which our hon. Member, Shri Arun Shourie asked through Indian Express on 1st August, 2006. He asked four questions, which give a reply in themselves. The four questions, which were asked by him are:

(a) Do the people of the area look to the police for protection from the Naxalites, or are they now conducting themselves in such a way that the Naxalites would spare them?

(b) Have the contractors of the area to pay Naxalites a cut for the works they execute—say, on construction involved in 'development projects'?

(c) Who is dispensing 'justice' in the area? The regular courts, or the Naxalites' mobile courts?

(d) Are the Government officials themselves not paying protection money to the Naxalites?

Sir, this situation is absolutely an honest picture as to what is happening in naxalite areas. And, therefore, if the police are made to pay the protection money, then what else remains. And, how those police, who are hand in hand with the Naxalites, would be able to cure the menace of Naxalites in the State. Therefore, if this is to be stopped, right governance is required. According to me, the Naxalites are spreading all over the country only because, in Arunji's words, the third class Government cannot give a first class response to terrorism. He says this because the Government has to be alert, the Government has to be determined and the Government has to take prompt and immediate action. then only, the problem of Naxalite can be solved. Sir, there are two schools of thoughts. One school of thought comes from Lage Raho Munna Bhai. I think, most of the hon. Members must have seen this picture. Therefore, they have always a sympathetic attitude towards the criminals and they feel, this school of thought feels that we should not punish the culprits; we should try to be sympathetic with them as much as possible. And, another school of thought is of those who have got a firm opinion that the exemplary punishment to the terrorist is the only way out. The general public in the country is supporting the second school of thought. Sir, let me tell the Government in the House that the delay in hanging of Mohammad Afzal Guru has also upset the minds of the people of our country. I am sure that the country feels that Afzal should be hanged at once. It is not that the procedure should not be followed. But, at the same time, my question to the hon. Minister is: Why is the Government not expressing its opinion on the issue? When there is a lot of debate in the newspapers, when there is a lot of discussion, at least, I have not been able to read from the Government's official statement that he should not be pardoned and the President should not take the issue lightly. People wanted that the Government should strictly stand up and say that Afzal Guru should not be pardoned under any circumstances. But, Sir, the Government has not expressed its opinion at all. This Government, or, for that purpose, any Government, or, any popular Government has to express its stand on the issue. And, this Government is not prepared to do it. Today, I would like to hear from the Hon. Minister what is the stand of the Government.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The stand of the Government has to be Constitutionally correct.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: I could not follow exactly what the Hon. Minister has said.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: What is required by law would be done.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, it is not necessary that the Government has to express its opinion on the issue. When there are reactions from the people, the Government can always say that this is the view of the Government.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Under the Constitution the matter has to be decided by one authority. Any other authority should not take the responsibility of doing that.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: I still personally feel that the Government cannot wait on such issues if the Government wants to avoid certain things. The communal tension unnecessarily increase because of this approach. And, some people have also thought that it is nothing but the appeasement of a particular community, for which the Government does not want to make its opinion clear on the issue. And, I personally feel that on such issues, the Government has to express its opinion even when the issue is raised in the House. The Government's desire on the issue has to come before the people. Sir not only this, it was so simple that nothing should have been said on this. People should have said only that 'wait, let us see what His Excellency, the President, does in the matter'. Lots of people expressed their opinion, including the political leaders. The Kashmir Bar Association and Hurriyat Conference have said that this is a part of conspiracy against the people of Kashmir. I fail to understand how it is a conspiracy. The courts—the High Court and the Supreme Court—decided that he should be sentenced to death. How is it connected with Kashmir? Why people are connecting this issue with Kashmir? The Government comes into picture because of the reactions made by different people. The United Jehad Council has threatened India of dire consequences. They said it would be against the human rights. They can say it with respect to human rights authority. But they said India would have to face serious consequences if he is put to death. Number of people expressed their opinion. Some opinions are 'for' and some 'against.' For instance,

Mr. Advani, the BJP Leader, has said that he should be hanged at once. Yes, it is not the only one. Dr. Farooq Abdullah, who is in the House now, is a good friend of mine. He also said that the nation would go up in flames and terrorist would destroy communal harmony. The nation will go up in flames! I don't understand this. Are we so much scared, or are we so weak? Is the country so weak that the country will go up in flames because of the hanging of one terrorist? He has also suggested that the judges, who gave this verdict, should be given protection. He is here. he can explain whether he has said it, or he has not said it, or why he has said it. But it is also said that he asked for the protection of the judges. I am sure the Government must have taken proper care or might have neglected also. He has warned the Government. He has also thought that there is a danger to the judges also. At the same time, I find that there are a number of people who don't want an action against Mr. Afzal. I personnally feel that this is a very sad situation in the country where we are asking for pardon for such type of culprit for no reason. When Parliament was attacked, I was here, and you will be surprised to know Mr. Vice-Chairman that one of the bullets came towards my chamber. it was my good fortune that I was saved and the man behind this attack was Mr. Afzal. Unfortunately, for him such request is being made by the people. At the same time, there were brave jawans of our Parliament who saved Parliament. The CRPF jawan, Kamlesh Kumari,...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN (Bihar): Will you yield for a minute?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Are you yielding?

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Yes, Sir.

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN: You have been Chief Minister and I am mystified by your contention that nobody should say that he should be excused or he should be hanged. Normally, I do not interrupt a Member, but I was mystified by your statement. It is the legal right of the person, who is convicted, to apply for a mercy. When a mercy appeal is filed, it has to be examined and on whatever decision the Government reaches, it has to be conveyed to the competent authority, that is, the President of India. So, when you say that the mercy petition should not be examined, I would like to remind you that when Mr. Bhutto was being hanged, the Congress Party and other parties also appealed to the world the he should not be hanged. So, you cannot say that nobody has a right to say that he should

be excused and he should not be hanged and all that. It will be ultimately the decision of the Government. How do you expect the Government to express the decision before the decision has been taken and before it has gone to the competent authority? I am amazed by it. You have been Chief Minister, there must have been cases, and such words coming from you have really mystified me. Thank you.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, unfortunately, the hon. Member has not understood me properly. I said, the Government should have expressed its opinion only because there were a number of opinions expressed by other people. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN: That doesn't matter. You cannot deny the right to a convict.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: The Government also is responsible. The Government is a popular Government; they have to express the opinion. People have a doubt in their minds that the Government does not want him to be hanged. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. Narayanasamy, please, let him continue. (*Interruptions*) He is not yielding. Please, let him continue. Nothing else is going on record. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: If somebody comes and threatens the Government that there will be dire consequences and it keeps quiet, that is objectionable.

श्री राजीव शुक्ला (महाराष्ट्र): *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Nothing else will go on record except Mr. Joshi's speech. (*Interruptions*) Please carry on. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY:*

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, people feel that this Government does not want to hang him. They want to find a way out; they want to threaten the Government; they want to threaten everybody; and the Government prepares to be silent on this issue, it's for them. Sir, the Congress Party

*Not recorded.

5.00 P.M.

also did not express its opinion. I don't know what is the reason. (*Interruptions*) What is the opinion of the congress Party, would you be able to tell me Mr. Narayanasamy? Give me the opinion. Just now, give me the opinion. (*Interruptions*) What is the opinion of the Congress Party?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Manohar Joshiji, whenever they will get a chance, they will react. You kindly address the Chair. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Mr. Narayanasamy, you can stand up and tell me just now. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please, Mr. Narayanasamy, you will have a chance to speak. You can clarify if you want to, at that point of time. (*Interruptions*) Please carry on. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, the family of Kamlesh Kumari who was martyred in the Parliament attack has threatened to return the Ashoka Chakra awarded to her family. If really something happens and if they returned the Ashok Chakra, I am sure, that will be shame on our part. The families of five Delhi Policemen who died in the Parliament attack said, they would return the Kirti Chakra if any concession is given to Afzal. These are the people who saved our lives; these are the people who saved this supreme body of the country. It is really surprising that some people come and say that don't punish them, don't take action against them. And, therefore, it is out of mere frustration, I say, that this is the country where such type of people can stand and speak. (*Interruptions*)

श्री राजीव शुक्ला : सर, एक बहुत important बात है....(व्यवधान).....

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: No, I am not yielding. I am not yielding to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI) He is not yielding. (*Interruptions*)

श्री विजय कुमार रूपाणी (गुजरात) : आप का समय आए तब बोलिए। (*Interruptions*)

श्री मनोहर जोशी : आप को मौका मिलेगा, उस समय बोलिएगा । Sir, these disturbances in different parts of the country are also because of the policies of the Government. The Government policies upset the people and sometimes such things occur because the Government does not expressly say anything on issues on which the Government is required to speak. Sir,

how can this situation be improved? Firstly, the police has to be effective and it has to be given authority to deal with the domestic terrorism. In the recent Mumbai blast, the Prime Minister himself had informed the State. He had informed the hon. Chief Minister and the police that such things might happen and this is very unfortunate that even though the information was received in advance, the Police Department did not act. The hon. Prime Minister came to Mumbai and he himself made a statement that he had expressed this fear, but nothing was done. Whether we can instruct our Police people or the concerned people to be more alert on the issue is a question before us. Sir, our Police have no modern weapons. They have outdated weapons while the enemies have sophisticated arms like AK-47 rifles. Our police officers have only revolvers. I don't think that unless and until such stronger weapons than the weapons held by the terrorists are given to them, the situation would improve. Therefore, what else is required is already expressed by Mr. Arun Jaitley in detail. You require to have a strong Act to take action against the terrorists. The POTA was cancelled for political reasons, and, thereafter, no new Act was enacted in place of POTA. Therefore, it is necessary that such things are done. The problem before the country is this. I have mentioned about certain parts. It is also true that the Islamic terrorism and the Maoist insurgency are the problems which we are facing today. I personally feel that a special law has to be enacted if we really want to save the people of our country.

And my last point is about appeasement. Sir, on this issue, I have to again quote the Prime Minister's statement. The hon. Prime Minister has said—it is a very important statement, Sir:

> "We must recognise that the Muslim community in large parts of the country nurses a strong grievance of not having been active participants and beneficiaries on processes of social and economic development. All of us have an obligation to redress legitimate grievances of our minorities."

Sir, I agree with this; I personally feel that legitimate grievances of minorities are to be resolved. I am not against the Muslims nor was I ever against the Muslims. And for the information of hon. Members, I would only say that during my tenure as Chief Minister, since somebody mentioned about it, there was not a single not against the Hindus and the Muslims in Maharashtra; that was the period. Therefore, it is not that I am speaking

something against the Muslims, but I am against the appeasement that is being done by the Government, and also by the Congress Party, in respect of Muslims.

Sir, I have already mentioned about the sentiments of the people of our country. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government knows that it is not the poor, illiterate, unemployed Indian Muslims alone but even the educated people who become terrorists. Sir, the information now received is—Sir, the Minister can correct me if I am wrong...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Terrorists are also there in other religions. Why do you specialise? ...*(Interruptions)*... This is not the kind of argument to make. ...*(Interruptions)*... Why do you say 'this community' or 'that community'? Terrorists are terrorists. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Narayanasamyji, you have made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, if we want to give a correct medicine, the diagnosis must be correct. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, if diagnosis is not correct, no proper medicine will be found. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, what is the kind of argument that he is making? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. Narayansamy, please sit down. You have made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*...You have made your point.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, he is a senior Member. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): You have made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD (Karnataka): *

श्री विजय कुमार रूपाणी: *

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: *

---

*Not recorded.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Nothing else except Mr. Manohar Joshi will go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

श्री विजय कुमार रूपाणी: *

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): आप जरा बैठ जाइए ...(व्यवधान)... Please carry on, Mr. Joshi....(व्यवधान)... Please carry on. ...*(Interruptions)*... पाणि जी, आप बैठिए ...(व्यवधान)... Please carry on, Mr. Joshi. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please carry on.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, during the last Session, I have requested ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanasamy, I am replying to your point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I will reply to him. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: *

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. V. Narayanasamy, you have made your point. He is going to clarify it. ...*(Interruptions)*... If you allow him, he will clarify the point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Nothing else except Mr. Manohar Joshi's speech is going on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Nothing is going on record. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiji, please carry on. ...*(Interruptions)*... Panyji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Panyji, please ...*(Interruptions)*...

---

*Not recorded.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: *

SHRI RUDRA NARAYAN PANY: *

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, this was the question which I raised in the last debate on Mumbai blasts in the House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please conclude ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I will not go away from my point. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have said that this appeasement policy is also creating internal disturbances. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Pany Sahib, please ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: I will give you examples. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will give you examples. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You don't talk about any particular religion. ...*(Interruptions)*... If you want to say something, you say in general. ...*(Interruptions)*... There are terrorists in the Hindu religion also. There are terrorists in the Muslim religion. ...*(Interruptions)*... Three are terrorists in the Christian religion also. But terrorists are terrorists. ...*(Interruptions)*... But why do you distinguish them? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Mr. Narayanasamy, you made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please give him a chance. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please give him a chance to clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please give him a chance to clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, the partition is created for the appeasement and for vote-bank. ...*(Interruptions)*... This is for vote-bank that you people have given this appeasement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Why are you targeting Muslims alone? ...*(Interruptions)*... Why are you targeting them alone? ...*(Interruptions)*... Your are doing that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

---

*Not recorded.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: We are not doing that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): May I request you to let me handle it? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Will you let me handle it? ...*(Interruptions)*... Will you let me handle it? ...*(Interruptions)*... Will you let me handle it? ...*(Interruptions)*... May I request you to let me handle it? ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: This is only for vote-bank. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let me handle it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshi Sahib, can you just clarify your point? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I was mentioning ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): He is clarifying the point. ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing is going on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I was mentioning that during the last debate in the House on the Mumbai blasts I had requested the hon. Minister to lay on the Table of the House the list of those accused people. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Why are they not tabling the list? ...*(Interruptions)*... Their reply is with the hon. Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, most of us have to go. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: In the 1993 Mumbai bomb blasts what had happened? ...*(Interruptions)*...

डा. फारूक अब्दुल्ला: नारायणसामी जी, मैं हाथ जोड़कर बोलता हूं। ...(**व्यवधान**)... हम अपना जवाब देंगे, जिसको ये सुन लेंगे कि मैंने क्या बोलना है। प्लीज, आप बैठ जाओ, मैं माफी

मांगता हूं, नहीं तो यह चलता रहेगा। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Farooq Sahib, do you agree with his argument? ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: No, I don't agree. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Narayanasamyji, I have to find out. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please one minute. ...*(Interruptions)*... I want to say something. The House can't run like this. Do you want the debate to continue or do you want the House to be adjourned? ...*(Interruptions)*... This can't continue like this. I am sorry. ...*(Interruptions)*... You have made your point, Mr. Narayanasamy. Joshiji is likely to clarify whatever he has spoken. ...*(Interruptions)*... Kindly bear with him. ...*(Interruptions)*... Kindly bear with him. ...*(Interruptions)*... This can't continue like this. I am sorry. ...*(Interruptions)*... पाणि साहब, प्लीज आप बैठ जाइए। ...*(Interruptions)*... Narayanasamyji, if you don't want to listen to the debate, I have no problem in adjourning the House. ...*(Interruptions)*... You have made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him clarify, ...*(Interruptions)*... Let him clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: My demand is that what he is talking would create communal disturbance in this country and, therefore ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: I want the Minister to reply. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): May I request you to let him speak? ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiji, please carry on. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA (Maharashtra): Sir, I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI): Please let him carry on. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let him carry on. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, my point is that during the last debate I had requested the hon. Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, there is a point of order.

...(Interruptions)...

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: ... to give the list of the accused people. *...(Interruptions)...*

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

SHRI VIJAY J. DARDA: Sir, I am on a point of order. Is he going to withdraw his remarks against the minority community? He cannot accuse the minority community like this.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: There is no rule that 'community' cannot be mentioned. Even in the earlier debates that we had on Mumbai blasts and the rail bomb blasts, I had requested the hon. Minister to put on the Table of the House the names of those who have been named as the accused. In the case of list of persons who have been named as the accused in connection with the Mumbai bomb blasts, you will find that these are people belonging to a particular community. Also, if we look at the names of persons who have been declared so far as guilty by the court, their names are also appearing in the Press; everybody knows whom they are. So, everybody knows it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has concluded. I have to adjourn the House now. *...(Interruptions)...* The Minister wants to say something.

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH: Sir, I just have one request. A point has been made by the hon. Member. I would like to speak tomorrow so that I can put my viewpoints before the House.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I want to make a simple submission to the House and to the people outside. It does not help to accuse any community saying that they are the terrorists. Terrorists are terrorists. They may belong to any religion; they may belong to any caste or to any group. Unfortunately, we have information that the people belonging to different religions and different regions are involved. But only some of them, or, a very few of them, are involved in this. So, we should not attack one community. Probably they were trying to do it; Shri Joshi was trying to explain something else. But this matter should not be presented to the House in such a fashion that the division is widened rather than narrowed.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: I would like to reply to this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough. There is no question here, and we cannot have any reply now. I fully agree with the sentiments of the hon. Members. We are debating a very important issue of internal security. We are already facing problems, and it is not right, as everybody has said, that we attribute something which would hurt the feelings of each other. So, while participating in the debate, it is better that we make points which would help control the situation rather than inflating the situation.

With these remarks, I would adjourn the House to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The House then adjourned at fifteen minutes past five of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 28th November, 2006.

MGIPMRND—3672RS—4-1-2008.